

1908.] **The Ornaments of the Church** [No. 416.
and its Ministers.

CONVOCAATION OF CANTERBURY.

UPPER HOUSE.

**REPORT OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE APPOINTED
FEBRUARY, 1907, TO DRAW UP A HISTORICAL
MEMORANDUM ON THE ORNAMENTS OF THE
CHURCH AND ITS MINISTERS.***

Prefatory Note to the Report.

This Report is now submitted by the Sub-Committee to the Bishops of the whole House, in pursuance of a Resolution of the Committee of the whole House appointed on the 14th February, 1907. The Sub-Committee has met seven times, viz., on 26 March, 1 May, 30 May, 21 June, and 23 October, 1907, and 22 and 23 January, 1908. We have divided the subject entrusted to us into three Chapters, to each of which we have prefixed a full analysis of contents. We have added two Appendices touching matters

* The Members of the Sub-Committee are :

The Bishop (*Dr. John Wordsworth*) of Salisbury (*Convener*).
" (*Dr. George F. Browne*) of Bristol.
" (*Dr. Archibald Robertson*) of Exeter.
" (*Dr. Edgar C. S. Gibson*) of Gloucester.
" (*Dr. Frederic H. Chase*) of Ely.

[This Report must be taken as having the authority only of the Sub-Committee by which it was prepared.]

Sold at the National Society's Depository, Westminster : and by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, Northumberland Avenue. Price 1s.

which could not be so well treated in the text. The titles of the Chapters and of the Appendices are as follows :—

CHAPTER I.—*Historical Sketch of the Origin, Development, and Symbolism of Liturgical Costume*, pp. 3-45.

CHAPTER II.—*The Ornaments Rubric of the Book of Common Prayer*, pp. 46-90.

CHAPTER III.—*The Ornaments of a Bishop in the Church of England*, pp. 91-107.

CONCLUSION.—P. 107.

APPENDIX A.—*On the Meaning of the term "Vestment,"* pp. 108-9.

APPENDIX B.—*Chronological list of Effigies of Anglican Bishops from A.D. 1547 to 1907*, pp. 110-120.

We may remark that we have in all cases treated the year as beginning on the first day of January, and have therefore tacitly altered the dates occurring in documents dated according to the old usage which assigned the days up to 25th March to the previous year.

Signed on behalf of the Sub-Committee,

JOHN SARUM, *Convener*.

23 January, 1908.

REPORT OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE OF THE UPPER HOUSE OF THE CONVOCATION OF CANTERBURY APPOINTED TO DRAW UP A HISTORICAL MEMORANDUM ON THE ORNAMENTS OF THE CHURCH AND ITS MINISTERS.

CHAPTER I.

HISTORICAL SKETCH OF THE ORIGIN, DEVELOPMENT, AND SYMBOLISM OF LITURGICAL COSTUME. Pp. 3-45.

§ 1. *Introduction. Growth of opinion as to the importance of liturgical costume.* Pp. 5-8.

§ 2. *General sketch of secular Roman dress and of its connexion with liturgical costume. The two under-garments (tunicae; subucula, and colobium) become alb and dalmatic. The upper-garments (paenula; lacerna and birrus) become respectively chasuble (phelonion, planeta, casula) and cope (pluviale, cappa). Certain accessories and ornaments, pallium (omophorion) orarium (stole) and mappula (maniple or fanon), are adopted by the Church as marks of dignity.* Pp. 8-11.

§ 3. *Instances of the identity of secular and liturgical dress. The law of 382, "de habitu intra urbem." Other instances. St. Gregory's pictures of his parents and himself. Chasuble and cope, pallium, orarium and mappula.* Pp. 11-5.

§ 4. *The early ornaments of a Bishop. The omophorion and pallium. Was there a Gallican pallium? Was the Roman pallium worn by grant from the Emperor?* Pp. 15-9.

§ 5. *Other ornaments of a Bishop from the seventh century. The pastoral staff or crosier. The ring. The cross-staff. The pectoral cross.* Pp. 19-23.

§ 6. *Other ornaments of a Bishop from the ninth century and later. Dalmatic and tunicle. Mitre (eleventh century). Its derivation from*

the papal processional head-dress. Gloves, shoes, &c. *The Rationale* (tenth and twelfth centuries). Pp. 23-7.

§ 7. *Later vestments of the clergy generally. Amice (ninth century); surplice (eleventh century). The almuce (twelfth century), the hood, scarf or tippet, and cap are all derived from the birrus. The rochet (thirteenth century); the chimere (fourteenth century) and cassock. Pp. 27-33.*

§ 8. *The symbolism of liturgical costume. Early speculations. Three later schools: (1) the moralizing school of Amalarius (ninth century); (2) the Christological school. Rupert of Deutz and Innocent III. Its later development looking to Christ's passion. Augsburg Missal of 1555; the English Rationale of 1540; (3) the allegorical school: the priest a champion. Absence of any authoritative interpretation. Explanation of the ornaments on the chasuble. Pp. 33-7.*

§ 9. *The origin and meaning of liturgical colours. White the festal colour, esp. for Easter; prescribed early in Egypt for general use. Freedom of usage in the East. Use of black for mourning. Black or dark prescribed c. 800 for Good Friday, &c., in the West. Beginning of rules for colours in twelfth century. Innocent III. (c. 1198) prescribes white, red, black (violet), and green (saffron). Later rules. Pp. 38-42.*

§ 10. *The benediction of vestments: no trace of it before the ninth century. Simplicity of the prayers in the Roman Rituale which are as old as the tenth or eleventh century. The forms in the Pontifical and the Missal are simple but inconsistent. Pp. 42-3.*

§ 11. *Summary. Tendency of this Chapter to dispel prejudices. On what grounds the use of vestments may be defended. Objections considered. Self-restraint needed. The matter here discussed requires settlement. Pp. 44-5.*

§ 1. INTRODUCTION.

Growth of opinion as to the importance of liturgical costume.

It has long been matter of general knowledge among scholars, though the bearing of the fact upon religious controversy has not always been popularly appreciated, that there is nothing mysterious about Christian liturgical dress or sacred vestments. They are simply the adaptation to religious use of the ordinary dress of civil, and particularly of official, life in the Roman Empire in the first centuries of our era. Whatever value they possess comes from two considerations, first their beauty, dignity and seemliness, and secondly their historical associations.

It is the object of this part of our Report to give a distinct and fairly detailed picture of the origin and growth of liturgical dress, to indicate what are its most ancient and primitive parts, and to note when and where various additions to it were made. In so doing we have freely used the collections of material made by our own and foreign scholars, some of which are mentioned in our notes.¹ We have also had much friendly correspondence with prominent ecclesiastical antiquaries, to whom our very sincere thanks are due.

At first the Christian clergy used no distinctive dress, and as long as the garb of daily life continued unaltered in the higher ranks of society, a celebrating or officiating Bishop, priest, or deacon differed, if at all, only in some slight variations of vesture from a well-dressed layman. How long this similarity lasted is not easy to describe in a few sentences. At Rome, where old-fashioned dress naturally continued longest, and where taste was, on the whole, in favour of severity rather than gorgeousness and elaboration, the difference between lay and clerical dress was

¹ The books most frequently referred to in writing this chapter have been L. Duchesne, *Origines du culte chrétien*, chapter xi. *le costume liturgique*, pp. 379-398, ed. 3, 1903; Joseph Braun, S. J., *Die liturgische Gewandung*, with 316 illustrations, Freiburg i./Br., 1907; F. X. Kraus, *Real-Encyclopädie der Christlichen Alterthümer*, 2 vols. Freiburg i./Br. 1882-6, esp. Krieg's article, *Kleidung*, vol. 2, pp. 175-215; and Smith and Cheetham *Dict. of Chr. Antiquities*, 2 vols. 1875 and 1880. W. B. Marriott's *Vestiarium Christianum*, London, 1868, is open to criticism in some respects, but is valuable as a collection of material and especially for its illustrations. Duchesne's sketch is excellent as far as it goes, and so is Krieg's article, but both refer to the early period, generally speaking up to Charles the Great. Braun's book is of course very much fuller, and it pursues the subject with great learning, research, and judgment, up to the present day. Besides these larger books a pamphlet of 58 pages with 37 illustrations by Joseph Wilpert, *Die Gewandung der Christen in den ersten Jahrhunderten*, Bachem, Köln, 1898, may be recommended as containing much practical information in a small compass. The illustrations are largely taken from paintings in the Roman catacombs.

probably not so apparent as in the provinces. Lay dress at Rome was more solemn, and clerical dress, if anything, less solemn than elsewhere. The first impulse, however, everywhere was naturally to insist upon a certain measure of refinement, beauty, and dignity in the dress of the clergy. Consciously or unconsciously they imitated the garb of official persons in the Empire, and put on the best they had or could procure for the service of God. This tendency can be traced to the third century, and it was defended by St. Jerome with his usual spirit in the fourth.² There can be no doubt that the conversion of Constantine to Christianity gave a great impetus to external splendour in all parts of Christian worship. His gift of a robe of gold tissue to Macarius of Jerusalem for use in baptism is the earliest notice we have of such a dress (Theodoret, *H. E.* ii. 27). It was probably a dalmatic or colobium. As time proceeded it was felt to be right to check the discretion or caprice of individuals, and to prescribe by canonical rule what had been hallowed by custom and religious association. The twenty-eighth charge brought against St. Chrysostom in 403, "that he puts off and puts on (his robes) in his throne and eats a biscuit" (Labbe. *Conc.* 2, 1327), shows that a special liturgical dress was then worn. The first clear evidence of the use of liturgical ornaments, with a religious sense, is in a letter of Isidore of Pelusium, c. 412 (*Ep.* i. 136, Marriott p. 49), to a Count Herminus, in which he explains the linen stole (*ὀβόρνῃ*) of deacons as a memorial of our Lord's humility in washing and wiping dry the disciples' feet, and the woollen Omophorion of Bishops as signifying the Good Shepherd who bears the sheep on his shoulders. He mentions also (*Ep.* i. 145) that the Bishop removes "the vestment of imitation" when the Gospel is read, because our Lord there speaks in person.

Feeling of this kind grew up in the fifth century. By the end of it a Fulgentius of Ruspe (468-533), who declined to use the official scarf (orarium) that all other Bishops wore, and who celebrated in the very tunic in which he used to sleep, though he may have been revered as an ascetic, was evidently regarded as an ex-

² Cf. *Canones Hippolyti* (in part as old as A.D. 200, and in part later), ed. Riedel, 37: "Whenever the Bishop takes part in the mysteries the Deacons and Presbyters should gather to him dressed in white garments, which are more beautiful than those of all the people and more brilliant." So S. Jerome *adv. Pelagianos*, i. 29: "Unde adiungis: *Gloriam vestium et ornamentorum Deo esse contrariam*. Quae sunt, rogo, inimicitiae contra Deum, si tunicam habuero mundiore, si Episcopus Presbyter et Diaconus et reliquus ordo ecclesiasticus in administratione sacrificiorum candida veste processerint?" Cp. the Clementine Liturgy, *Ap. Const.* VIII. 12 (circa 390), λαμπρὰν ἱσθῆτα μετινύς. On the other hand Pope Celestine writes to the Bishops of the provinces of Vienne and Narbonne in 428 against the introduction of monastic dress, *Ep.* iv 2: "Discernendi a plebe, vel ceteris, sumus doctrina, non veste; conversatione, non habitu; mentis puritate, non cultu."

ceptional person.³ Nevertheless it was only slowly and locally that prescriptions about vestments were formulated. The earliest are those canons of the Phrygian Laodicea of uncertain date, but somewhere about the year 400, which forbid a subdeacon, reader, or psalter to wear the scarf or stole (orarium).⁴ Nothing is said about dress in the *Gallican Statutes*, from the province of Arles (circa A.D. 500), which have had much influence on the rites of ordination, except that a deacon is to wear an alb “tempore oblationis tantum vel lectionis (c. 41).” In the same age, in the year 513, Pope Symmachus gave Caesarius of Arles leave that his deacons should wear dalmatics like the Roman deacons (below n. 18). Tradition ascribed the use of dalmatics by Roman deacons to an order of Pope Silvester (c. 314-335). Regulations about vestments seem, however, to have been more congenial to the Gallican and Spanish than to other Churches, and the canons of their Councils in the sixth and seventh centuries are important for our subject. From one of these we learn that the distinctive ornaments of a Bishop, given at ordination, were orarium, anulus and baculus; of a Presbyter, orarium and planeta; and of a deacon, orarium and alba (4 *Conc. Tolet.* A.D. 633, c. 28). Other rules about the orarium are mentioned below. But, while these canons show that a certain amount of attention was given to the subject of vestments, they do not imply anything like the personal feeling with which the right to wear the pallium—probably a decoration of secular origin—was debated between Popes and Bishops during the sixth century.

There is, indeed, some evidence that the Spanish and Gallican Churches had books which are now lost prescribing the manner of celebrating the sacraments earlier than the rest of Christendom. The fourth Council of Toledo, A.D. 633, c. 26, ordered the Bishop in sending a presbyter to a parish to give him a book of instructions or “libellus officialis,” that he might not make any mistake in such matters. None of these has come down to us, but we possess in the two letters attributed to St. Germanus of Paris (c. 555-567) a precious commentary on the Gallican Liturgy, which contains some mystical remarks on the dress of the clergy. It is also from Spain that we have one of the earliest attempts to connect the dress of the clergy with that of the Levitical priesthood.⁵

³ *Vita*, c. 18 in *P. L.*, 65, 136: Nunquam pretiosa vestimenta quaesivit . . . una tantum vilissima tunica, sive per aestatem sive per hiemem, est patienter indutus. Orario quidem sicut omnes episcopi nullatenus utebatur. Pellicio cingulo tanquam monachus utebatur . . . Casulam pretiosam vel superbi coloris nec ipse habuit nec monachos suos habere permisit. Subtus casulam nigello vel lactinio pallio circumdatus incessit . . . in qua tunica dormiebat in ipsa sacrificabat; et tempore sacrificii mutanda esse corda botius quam vestimenta dicebat.

⁴ Canons 22 and 23. The date of this collection is ordinarily placed between the Council of Antioch, 343, and that of Constantinople, 381, but there is some probability that it is to be dated later.

⁵ See the Canons of St. Martin of Braga, circa 580, No. 66 (Bruns 2, 56): “non oportet clericos comam nutrire et sic ministrare, sed attonso capite,

But it is to the Carolingian revival of the eighth and ninth centuries, to the *Ordines* published by Mabillon and Duchesne, and to the treatises of Rabanus Maurus, Amalarius, and their contemporaries, that we must look for evidence of a parallel to the modern interest in vestments.

It is to the writers of that age that we must attribute the currency given to the idea that vestments are matters of great importance, and that they are to be interpreted with the same mystical imagination as the holy garments of Aaron and his family. Yet in one, even, of these writers, Walafrid Strabo (*de rebus eccl.* 24) we have an interesting and rational (though incorrect and imperfect) historical sketch of the development of liturgical dress from ordinary costume.

It is needless to say that the mystical interpretations are artificial, and that they should be dismissed from the mind of any inquirer at the present day, except so far as they serve to explain the later development of some ornaments (such as the rationale) and the tenacity and enthusiasm with which some persons have defended, and some have attacked, the old vestments of the Church. It may, perhaps, astonish our English controversialists to learn the truth that the letter of the law as regards vestments is stricter in the Anglican than in the Roman communion. The Council of Trent merely mentions "vestes" as part of the Apostolic traditions of the Church (*Sess.* xxii., *de sac. missae*, c. 5). The *rubricae generales* of the missal are in form historical and descriptive, not imperative (*celebrans semper utitur, &c., rubr.* xix. 1).

§ 2. *General sketch of secular Roman dress, and of its connexion with liturgical costume.* The two under-garments (*tunicae*; *subucula*, and *colobium*) become alb and dalmatic. The upper-garments (*paenula*, *lacerna*, and *birrus*) become respectively chasuble (*phelonion*, *planeta*, *casula*) and cope (*pluviale*, *cappa*). Certain accessories and ornaments, *pallium* (*omophorion*), *orarium* (*stole*), and *mappula* (*maniple* or *fanon*), are adopted by the church as marks of dignity.

The principal garments of daily life in the first centuries of our era were of two kinds, an indispensable under-garment or tunic, and an upper-garment, not always worn indoors or in the country, which was put on as a protection against rain and cold. In the Augustan age, as we learn from Varro (*apud Nonium* s.v.

patentibus auribus, et secundum Aaron talarem vestem induere, ut sint in habitu ordinato." Cf. *Iren. haer.* iv. 20, 11, who says of our Lord's appearance in Rev. i. 13, "significat . . . aliquid . . . sacerdotale, ut podere[s]." The opening words of Eusebius' address to the Bishops at the dedication of the Church at Tyre (*H. E.* x. 4) in which he salutes them as wearing τὸν ἄγιον ποδήρη and the crown of glory and the divine unction and the priestly robe of the holy spirit, are clearly figurative

subucula) people were already accustomed to wear two tunics, and we know that Augustus himself wore four (Suetonius, *Aug.* 82).⁶ The Romans usually wore an under-tunic with sleeves (*subucula*) at first always made of wool. Linen, which was worn in Egypt and Syria, did not come into use for men at Rome till, probably, the beginning of the third century (cf. *Hist. Aug., Alexander*, c. 40). The upper tunic was one with only short sleeves (*colobium*). Closely akin to it, and perhaps sometimes synonymous with it in civil life, was the dalmatic (*Edictum Diocletiani* 17, 1, Epiphanius *haer.* 15), of which the first appearance in literature is about the end of the second century (*Hist. Aug., Commodus*, c. 8). The material of this upper tunic might be wool, silk, or, in later times, linen, and the dalmatic in church-use seems generally to have had rather ample sleeves as being worn over an under-tunic, whether woollen or linen. The famous statue of St. Hippolytus (*R.E.* fig. 244, and *Opera*, ed. Fabricius, p. 36 foll.) which must have been erected within 20 years of his death, and therefore about 250 A.D., represents him as dressed in two tunics reaching down to his feet, and with a Greek pallium (such as philosophers wore) over them. The upper tunic may be a dalmatic, but the sleeves are very long and full, and apparently bound round the lower part of the arms and wrists, unless the line represents an ornamental stripe. The body of the dalmatic was often marked with two vertical stripes of dark, often purple, colour before and behind.

As regards the upper-garment, the cumbersome toga, which was an immense semi-circle of cloth, requiring great art to dispose its folds with any ease and gracefulness, was from the first century onwards increasingly laid aside in favour of simpler garments. The pallium (the Greek himation), which was the rival of the toga, was a plaid said to be three times as long as its breadth. It was often used as a mantle by Christians (*Tert. de pallio* 6), and it frequently appears on Christian paintings in the catacombs as worn by Old Testament saints, and even by our Lord (Wilpert, pp. 10-12). But it was probably not sufficient for real comfort in the climate of Italy, and recourse was had to warmer capes and cloaks. These were, in civil life, of two kinds, (1) the circular paenula, with an opening for the head in the centre, which fell down below the knees, and (2) the hooded semi-circular lacerna, fastened with a buckle on the shoulder or under the chin, and the birrus, a smaller shoulder-cape with a stiff and very pronounced hood.

From these two types of garment, answering to our shirt and cloak, which were of very wide use even outside the Roman

⁶ Our Lord's command not to wear two tunics implies that the custom, which in Palestine was a luxurious and unnecessary one, was then spreading. (*St. Matt.* x. 10, and *St. Mark* vi. 9; cf. the Baptist's words, *St. Luke* iii. 11).

Empire, are derived with absolute certainty the principal sacred vestments both of the Eastern and Western Churches.⁷

From the tunic we have in the East the sticharion, or under-tunic, common to all clergy, which may be of silk, wool, linen, or cotton, and the sakkos, a kind of dalmatic, apparently in imitation of imperial dress, worn by Patriarchs and Metropolitans and many other Bishops over the sticharion. In the West we have at least five vestments, two of them ancient, viz. the linen alb or under-tunic, and the costlier dalmatic or upper-tunic. The three modern vestments derived from the tunic are the tunicle of sub-deacons (now scarcely distinguishable from the dalmatic of deacons), the surplice, and the rochet—the two latter being of linen.

From the paenula we have the Greek phelonion (a diminutive of phaenoles or phelones⁸=paenula), and the Latin planeta, which in Africa, Gaul, and Spain was called, from the completeness of the covering which it afforded, by the name casula. The latter seems to be first mentioned by St. Augustine, *de civ. dei*, xxi. 8, 9, as an out-of-door dress for working men, whereas the paenula (or planeta) was worn by wealthier persons. Other names for this garment are, "amphibalus"—which was in use in the Gallican Church in pre-Caroline times—and "infula," which is a term especially used in England and France from the eleventh century onwards up to the sixteenth (*Braun*, pp. 152-3). But the ordinary names are planeta and casula in the West and phelonion in the East. As liturgical vestments the phelonion and the chasuble are essentially the same, and if they ever had hoods they have long ceased to possess them.⁹ The only difference is that the Greek phelonion is cut away or scooped out in front, and the Latin chasuble trimmed at the sides, in both cases for the convenience of the wearer.

Besides these principal garments, which, with varying degrees of

⁷ It is probable that our Lord wore an upper garment of one piece (himation *Heb.* tallith) as well as a tunic woven in one piece. See St. John xix. 23, 24, and Edersheim, *Life of Christ*, i. pp. 624-6, 1883.

⁸ St. Paul's cloak, which he left behind at Troas (2 Tim. iv. 13), was a paenula (phelones).

⁹ Isidore (*Orig.* xix. 24, 17) says: "Casula est vestis cucullata dicta per diminutionem a casa, quod totum hominem tegat, quasi minor casa." Wilpert says that the hood still appears in "miniatures" of the tenth century (l. c. p. 44). Reference is apparently to the illustrations 28, 33-35, from the Pontifical of Landulpus of Beneventum. The derivation of planeta is uncertain, but it seems to be short for planetica *sc.* vestis, as in Cassian *Inst.* i. 6, where he says of monks that they wear "mafortes" (cowls) of small value, "et ita planeticarum atque byrriorum pretia simul ambitionemque declinant." The epithet would describe the vague and sinuous motion of a costly and ample robe, such as is pictured in Herrick's well-known poems (*Golden Treasury*, p. 76 foll.). The Spanish "poncho," from an adjective meaning "slack," "hanging loose," is only a civil form of the chasuble, which is in use to the present day. It is described as "especie de sayo sin mangas, que se pone por la cabeza à modo de casulla ó cosa semejante" (*Nuevo Dicc. de la lengua Castellana*, Paris, 1853).

richness or comfort, were common to all grades of civil life, officials in the Roman world were distinguished by certain accessories or decorations which have passed from the world into the Church. The most prominent of these is the pallium, which has had a remarkable and indeed a momentous history. The pallium, as its name implies, is connected historically with the Greek plaid, already described, which the Romans called a pallium. It had, however, while still an article of Roman official dress, degenerated or developed into a long scarf, which was worn twisted round the neck, with one end hanging down in front and the other down the back, in a manner which was a survival of a common way of wearing the toga or the pallium—it is uncertain which—when the wearers wished to move quickly. Probably at first the official pallium was an actual pallium of thin material folded to a narrow breadth and worn for convenience in the way described.

Besides the pallium the ancients used certain handkerchiefs and napkins, very much as we do to this day. One of them, like the pallium, became a scarf, and was worn on one shoulder or round the neck (orarium). Another, the mappula, when not carried in the hand, was folded over the left fore-arm, and became the ecclesiastical maniple. Antique dress, we must remember, had no pockets, and such handkerchiefs, when not in use for other purposes, had to be carried on the person in some such way as this.

§ 3. *Instances of the identity of secular and liturgical dress. The law of 382, "de habitu intra urbem." Other instances. St. Gregory's pictures of his parents and himself. Chasuble and cope, pallium, orarium and mappula.*

The above general sketch will enable us to understand some instances which may be given to prove the substantial identity of ancient civil and ecclesiastical dress. An excellent illustration will be found in a law of the Emperors Gratian, Valentinian, and Theodosius of the year 382, regulating the dress of senators and other officials entering within the walls of Rome and Constantinople, and thereupon laying down their military dress.¹⁰

¹⁰ *Cod Theod.* xiv. 10, 1, *de habitu quo uti oportet intra urbem*: "nullus Senatorum habitum sibi vindicet militare, sed chlamydis terrore deposito, quieti coloborum ac penularum induat vestimenta . . . officiales quoque . . . uti quidem penulis iubemus, verum interiorem vestem admodum cingulis observare: ita tamen ut discoloribus quoque palliis pectora contegentes condicionis suae necessitatem ex huiusmodi agnitione testentur. Servos sane omnium (quorum tamen dominos sollicitudine constat militiae non teneri) aut byrris uti permittimus aut cucullis." This law is quoted by Duchesne, but not quite as fully as here; and he has accidentally taken the date of the next law (397) as applying to this (*Origines*, p. 379).

The civil garb of Senators here described was to be a short-sleeved tunic or dalmatic (colobium) and a paenula. Their "officials" were to have their under garments girdled—no doubt to increase their activity—and to wear "pallia" of two colours over their paenulas in order that they might be easily recognised and respected in the performance of their duties.¹¹ Their slaves—at least those whose masters were not officers in the army—were permitted to wear russet cloaks or hoods (byrris uti permittimus aut cucullis). By these cloaks, which appear to derive their name from their colour (byrrus = *πυρρός*), we are, as has been already explained, to understand the common stiff form of that semi-circular cape, with a hood for the head, which in its more elegant fashion is called the lacerna. They were of course, unlike the paenula, open in front, and the lacerna (if not the birrus) could be fastened over the breast with a buckle or brooch. From one or both of these capes it seems pretty clear that the ecclesiastical cope (pluviale, cappa) has been derived.¹²

Thus we find in this one civil law mention of five of the main types of ecclesiastical vestments, viz. the dalmatic, the girdled tunic or alb, the chasuble, the pallium, and the cope, as articles of lay dress. Of these the *Tunic* was, as we have seen, in slightly different forms, common to all classes and to both sexes. The *Paenula* or *planeta*, though used by persons of a higher class, was also worn by both sexes, and by laymen as well as clergy, even in the sixth century. It is said that the nobles sheltered Fulgentius, on his return from exile to Carthage, from a storm of rain, with their planetae (*Vita*, c. 29, *P. L.* 65, 146), and we find the Empress Theodora and one or more of her ladies represented as robed in planetae in the famous mosaic at Ravenna (*Kraus, R.E. s.v. Kleidung*, p. 203. It is well figured in T. Hodgkin's *Italy and her Invaders*, vol. iii. p. 606, 1885). There is therefore nothing surprising in the fact that Gregory the Great caused his father Gordianus and his mother Silvia to be depicted, together with himself, as all wearing this garment, probably in the chapel of St. Andrew attached to his church on the Coelian Hill.¹³ Gordianus like

¹¹ There is a good illustration of the pallium worn by "officials" in the engraving of a sepulchral monument to Julius Hilarus and Julius Modestinus given in Grævius, *Thesaurus* vi. p. 971.

¹² Duchesne does not discuss the cope, while Braun is inclined to derive it from the paenula slit up the front, p. 348 foll. Dr. Legg also has suggested a common origin for the cope and chasuble. *Archæol. Journal* 51, p. 39, 1894. But the paenula and the pluviale belong to such distinct types, the first being circular and the second semi-circular in plan, and the first never being known to have a fibula on it, while the morse of the second is only a brooch substituted for a fibula, that the suggested derivation from the lacerna appears almost certain.

¹³ *Vita* a Joh. Diacono iv. 83. Mr. Marriott in his *Vestiarium*, pl. xxv., reproduces the engraving of these pictures which may be found in Baronius, *Annals*, A.D. 604, No. 27, and treats it as an old copy of the originals (see p. 238). But Baronius says that the latter were entirely lost, and that he had printed his

himself wore a planeta of chestnut colour and under it a dalmatic. His mother Silvia wore a white dress from which her hands appeared drawn out "as if from under a planeta" (*ut sub eo manus tamquam de planeta subducat*) and under it a tunic, "*pseudolactini coloris*," by which an ash-grey tint is perhaps meant. It is probable that Silvia's dress was a planeta, like that of her husband, but that John the Deacon, writing about 872, was rather scrupulous in saying so directly. For the casula had then become an article of daily clerical costume, as it is prescribed by St. Boniface at his Council of A.D. 742, c. 7. But there was nothing sacerdotal about it. The word *amphibalus*, though used by St. Germanus in the sixth century as equivalent to the priest's chasuble (*P.L.* 72, 97), continued to denote an article of lay and even female dress up to the eleventh century (Braun, p. 153). Of the casula Amalarius tells us in 816 (*de eccl. off.* ii. 19), that it was the "*generale indumentum sacrorum ducum*," and one which "*pertinet generaliter ad omnes clericos*." He is therefore careful to explain that, as such, it must signify the works which pertain to all, among which he enumerates "*lectio, psalmodia, oratio, labor operandi, doctrina, silentium*" and makes no reference to any sacrament. Even to the present day, in Lent and Advent and other penitential seasons, the chasuble is worn, in the Roman communion, by deacons and sub-deacons (Martene, *de ant. rit.* iii. p. 78, *Rubricae generales Missalis*, xix. 6, Duchesne, p. 381, n.) It is not easy to say when the planeta or casula became general in liturgical use. It was certainly later than the alb and dalmatic, and the comments of Tertullian, Jerome, and Chrysostom on the paenula of St. Paul show that it never occurred to them to think of it in connection with liturgical use (cf. Marriott, pp. 209-210). It was an outdoor garment gradually introduced inside the Church. The first clear instance of liturgical use is in the letter of St. Germanus of Paris, where it is called *amphibalus* (as already noticed) and *casula*; the second (planeta) is in the 28th canon of the fourth Council of Toledo of 633.

As for the *Cope*, or rain-cloak (*pluviale*), if we are right, as it seems almost certain that we are, in deriving it from the *lacerna* or *birrus*, there can be no doubt as to its origin in ordinary dress. It is even less than the chasuble confined to any order of the ministry, and may be worn by singers or even by all the members of a convent (Braun, l.c. pp. 315 foll.). It was originally an out-of-door dress, and as such is largely used in processions. In the West the cope was not used as a liturgical dress. It is, however,

illustration from the pictures made up by the industry of Angelo Rocca, the Sacrist of Pope Clement VIII., working on similar examples. The engraving therefore has no claim to antiquity, but it may very likely give a good idea of what the pictures represented. Marriott apparently had never looked at Baronius, but borrowed the picture from some intermediate source.

so used to the present day among the Syrians, both the East Syrians or Nestorians and the Jacobites, and both by Bishops and Priests. By the East Syrians it is called *ma'aphra*, the same word apparently as the Greek *maphorion* and the Latin *mafors*, &c. : by the Jacobite Syrians it is called *phaina*. It is also used as a liturgical vestment by the Copts, who call it by the common Arabic name *bourrus*, which may possibly represent a Greek *πυρρινός*, and so be connected with the *birrus*.

The instances of the use of the *birrus* by St. Cyprian and St. Athanasius show that it was part of their ordinary habit. St. Cyprian at his martyrdom first put off his *birrus*, and prostrated himself in prayer, then took off his dalmatic or ample upper tunic, and then stood in his linen tunic to receive the executioner's blow (*Acta procons.* c. 5). St. Athanasius, when flying by night, caught up his tunic (*sticharion*) and *birrus* (*birin* or *birrhion*) evidently as the dress in which he was least likely to be recognised (*Hist. Lausiaca* 63, ed. Butler).

Besides these larger articles of dress we have, as already mentioned, the *pallium*, the *orarium*, and the *mappula* or *maniple* as accessories of official costume. In the law of A.D. 382 the *Pallium* is referred to as worn by subordinate officials, but it was also worn by emperors and consuls.¹⁴ In the case of emperors it was sometimes called *lorum*, and it appears from coins to have been worn crossed over the breast, something like the stole of a priest. Its use as an episcopal ornament is discussed in the next section.

How far the *Orarium* was an official ornament in the Roman Empire is not quite clear. It was a linen handkerchief (*sudarium*, *ὀθόνη*, *ὀθόριον*), but apparently longer and narrower than our modern handkerchief. One of the earliest mentions of *oraria* in history is as given by the Emperor Aurelian (270-5) to the people to use as signs of favour to competitors in the public games.¹⁵ Similarly *ὀθόρια* were waved by the people in the Church of Antioch to applaud the contemporary Paul of Samosata.¹⁶

The earliest reference to the liturgical use of the *orarium* (*ὀράριον*) is probably in the 22nd and 23rd canons of Laodicea already referred to in § 1. The next is in Isidore of Pelusium, who speaks of it (*ὀθόνη*) as being used by deacons (*epist.* i 136, *circa* 412). Similar to this is the passage in the *Homily on the*

¹⁴ See the plates in Marriott, xxii. xxiii., and in Ferrarius *Analecta de re Vestiaria*, in Grævii *Thesaurus*, vi. pp. 1083-6, 1697, and cp. Ducange, s.v. *lorum*, who besides quoting the well-known passage from the Donation of Constantine (quoted below) refers to Greek authorities and especially to the coins of the Emperor Maurice (582-602).

¹⁵ *Hist. Aug. Vopisci Aurelianus*, c. 48, cf. Pollionis *Claudius* 17, 7.

¹⁶ Eus. *H. E.* vii. 30, 9. On applause in churches see Ferrarius *de veterum acclamationibus et plausu*, who devotes his seventh book to ecclesiastical applause, in Grævii *Thesaurus*, vi. pp. 135-164.

Prodigal Son § 3, once ascribed to S. Chrysostom (ed. Gaume viii. p. 655), which compares the deacons *ᾄδοντες*, fluttering on their left shoulders, to angels' wings. They were evidently of thin white linen. In the *Canons of Athanasius*, No. 39, the deacon is ordered to fan with his *epômis*, probably his stole, during the "anaphora." The date is probably after 451. The next mention of the *orarium* is in the life of Fulgentius of Ruspe (note 3), where it is spoken of as worn by Bishops. The Spanish use of the *crarium* is touched on in the next section. Its liturgical use in the Roman West cannot be traced higher than the sixth century. It looks as if an article of ordinary daily life had been first introduced as a decoration into the Eastern Church, and then had come back after a considerable period, in its new form, to Rome. As late as the twelfth century we find an *orarium* of the form of a long handkerchief in the Barberini "exultet roll" (Wilpert, fig. 32). It may perhaps be copied from some earlier illustration.

The *Mappula*, like the pallium, had a more distinctly Roman and official origin. It was the napkin with which the consul or prætor gave the sign for the chariots to start in the circus, and so it became a magisterial decoration. It is consequently often seen on late consular diptychs,¹⁷ just as it is in the diptych of Pope Gregory the Great, which is so close a parallel in point of dress to a consular diptych that it has been supposed, probably erroneously, to be a real consular diptych altered in his honour.

The mappula when not in use was apparently carried wrapped round the left forearm, as the maniple or fanon is, which is the same thing with a new name; but in one of these diptychs it is held by the consul in his right hand resting on the right knee (Marriott, pl. xxiii). Gregory the Great had a rather amusing quarrel with John III. Bishop of Ravenna about the use of the mappula by the deacons of that city, which was a by-issue in the greater quarrel about the pallium (*Epp.* iii. 56, 57, v. 11, 15). The Roman mappula has often been identified with the hanging cuffs of the Greek dress (*epimanikia*, *hypomanikia*); but the identification is rejected by Braun (l.c. 109),

§ 4. *The early ornaments of a Bishop. The omophorion and pallium. Was there a Gallican pallium? Was the Roman pallium worn by grant from the Emperor?*

Probably the earliest distinctive ornament of a Bishop (unless we call the book, which he is often represented as bearing in his hand, an ornament) is, as has been already suggested, the

¹⁷ See Mayor's note on Juvenal, xi. 193, and Marriott, plates xxii. (Boethius, A.D. 510), xxiii. (Clementinus, A.D. 513), and Gregory the Great at Monza.

Omophorion, called by the Latins *pallium*. The word *Omophorion* is used in the technical sense, as a part of episcopal dress as early as the first half of the fifth century by Isidore of Pelusium, in the letter already referred to, who suggests that it, being made of wool, is a symbol of the lost sheep carried round the neck of the Good Shepherd (*Epist.* i 136, cp. 145). From that date to this it has been a common ornament of Bishops in the Eastern Church, but it does not appear in the fourth century.

The question whether a similar ornament was in use in the "Gallican" West—Africa, Spain, and Gaul—is not very easy to determine. Duchesne (p. 388 n. 2) seems to assume that it was so, while Braun denies it (pp. 674-676). That an "orarium" was used in these countries by Bishops as a mark of their dignity, and that it was sometimes called "*pallium*," is of course admitted; but the question still remains whether an ornament like the Greek *omophorion*, and the papal *pallium*, is meant, or whether *pallium* is to be understood in the sense of "scarf" as a sort of generic term, and we are to conclude that it was worn like the modern stole.

The texts are as follows. First we have the African monk Fulgentius, as Bishop of Ruspe, declining (about A.D. 508) to wear the orarium, which all other Bishops wore (above, note 3). In the sixth and seventh centuries we hear a good deal more about the orarium in Spain than in other countries. It is first mentioned as an ornament of the diaconate in the 9th Canon of the first Council of Braga, A.D. 561. At the fourth Council of Toledo, A.D. 633, which abolished the Roman and established the Gallican rite, it is mentioned in Canon 28, three times in lists of the ornaments of all three orders given at their ordination, and in Canon 40 it is ordered that no Bishop, Presbyter, or Deacon, and in particular no Deacon, should wear two *oraria* at once. At the third Council of Braga, 675, in Canon 4, the priest was reminded of his duty to wear the orarium on both shoulders, as he received it at his consecration, "in the time of the sacrifice," and to have it crossed over his breast, as priests now wear it generally in the West. (Cf. Braun, pp. 570-4.) On the other hand we have sixth century evidence from the neighbouring provinces of Gaul, which used the same Liturgy, of the use of a similar ornament called *palleum* or *pallium*. It has the first name in the letters of S. Germanus of Paris, A.D. 555-576 (*P. L.* 72, 97), in an obscure passage in which it is identified with the *rationale* of the Old Testament. Lastly, at the first Council of Macon in 581, c. 6, the true text is acknowledged to be: "*Ut episcopus (not archiepiscopus) sine pallio missas dicere non praesumat.*" This last canon is the most important for the argument. There is also evidence, as we shall see, from Ravenna that Bishops of that see claimed to use the *pallium* independently of Roman privilege.

However this may have been in "Gallican" provinces, in Rome and in the suburbicarian churches the pallium was not usually worn in early times except by the Pope, and perhaps by the Bishop of Ostia, as consecrator of the Pope (*Liber Pontif.* under Marcus, the successor of Silvester). The Bishops of Rome and Alexandria had, as is well known, a different relation of superiority towards their suffragans from that possessed by other metropolitans; and it has always been the policy of the Bishops of Rome to extend this relation to other regions. Hence arose the practice of their giving the right to use a particular kind of pallium to individual Bishops whom they thus constituted their representatives, or Vicars, or to Bishops generally of metropolitan sees, who thus accepted a delegated authority. The first known instance of this policy is the case of Caesarius of Arles, A.D. 513, who, it is said, received from Pope Symmachus the right to use the pallium "per omnes Gallicanas regiones."¹⁸

It may be interesting to enumerate other instances of dealings with the pallium which are known to us in the sixth century, the great period of its rise into importance in the Roman West.¹⁹ They illustrate both its probable origin and the importance attached to it.

Some fifteen years later than the grant to Cæsarius, Pope Felix IV. (526-530) tried to secure the succession to the papacy to his archdeacon, Bonifatius, by giving him his own pallium in the presence of witnesses (Duchesne, *Lib. Pontif.* i. p. 282). A few years later Belisarius took away the pallium from Pope Silverius (536-8), whom he desired to depose from his office (l.c. p. 293). In 545-6 Vigilius gave the pallium to the successors of Caesarius at Arles, Auxanius and Aurelianus. The pallium was worn in the papacy of Pelagius I. (555-60), by Secundus of Taurominium, in Sicily, and under John III. (560-573) by Peter of Ravenna. Gregory the Great granted the pallium to the Metropolitans of Milan, Salona, Corinth, Nicopolis, Justiniana Prima (Ochrida in Albania), Seville, Arles, and Canterbury (A.D. 600), as well as to the Bishops of Messina, Palermo, Syracuse, and Autun; and, after a struggle, he permitted its continuance in the case of John III., Metropolitan of Ravenna,

¹⁸ Symmachi *Ep.* 15, c. 6, 9, ed. Thiel, p. 727, who notices that this clause about the pallium is omitted by Sirmond, and *Vita Caesarii*, i. 4, 30 (*P. L.* 67, 1016): "Pro qua re etiam Papa Symmachus . . . non solum verissime eum metropolitanae honore suscepit, sed et concessio specialiter pallii decoravit privilegio. Diaconos ipsius ad Romanae instar ecclesiae dalmaticarum fecit habitu prae-eminere."

¹⁹ They may be found in Braun, p. 625 (cf. 634-9), who is fuller on this point than Duchesne, *Origines*, p. 384-5. Much information about the pallium, its appearance in art and the methods of blessing it, may be found in Dr. Wickham Legg's paper, *The Blessing of the Episcopal Ornament called the Pall in Yorkshire Archaeol. Journal*, vol. 15, pp. 121-141 (for September, 1898).

who had worn it, as an assertion of the rights of his see, without papal permission (Greg. *Epp.* iii. 56, 57, cf. v. 11, 15). John's later successor, Maurus (A.D. 648-671), who was a rebel against the papacy, asked for and obtained the pallium from the Emperor Constans II. The matter of the Ravenna pallium is obscure, but evidently very important. It would seem that the claim to use it rested on an assertion that it had been given by Valentinian III. (425-455) to John II. of Ravenna (c. 452-477), *i.e.* between 452 and 455, and afterwards by Justinian (527-565) to Maximianus (Agnellus *Lib. pont. Ravennat.* n. 40, 70, quoted by Braun, p. 653). It is impossible to say whether this claim is true; but it is not at all improbable that an emperor in the fifth century should give an honorary garment to a Bishop of the shape and colour of that worn by himself, just as Constantine the Great long before gave a robe of gold tissue (probably a dalmatic) to Macarius, Bishop of Jerusalem, for use in baptism (Theodoret, *H. E.* ii. 27). What improbability is there that Valentinian III. should give a similar present to the Bishop of the city in which he ordinarily resided? And since, in the fifth century and later, lay dress and liturgical dress was the same, John II. of Ravenna had a perfect right to wear such a gift, and his successors perhaps had a like privilege.

Are we then to assign any degree of probability to the assertion made in the spurious *Constitutum Constantini* that that Emperor gave to Pope Sylvester (314-335) "superhumerales videlicet lorum qui imperiale circumdare assolet collum," with many other imperial ornaments and privileges (*Decretales*, ed. Hinschius, p. 253)? The thing is not in itself improbable, but it is improbable from its association with so much falsehood and its late appearance. Nor is there any trace of this particular ornament in the first half of the fourth century.

It is possible (as Duchesne suggests, but as Braun contests) that both the general use of the omophorion by Eastern Bishops, and of the pallium by the Popes, depended on some grants or gifts by the civil powers of which the details are now lost. The pallium at any rate was treated by the Emperors and their representatives, like Belisarius, as something which stood in a particular relation to them. As Duchesne remarks (*Origines*, pp. 384-5) when Gregory sent the pallium to Bishops who were not subjects of the Greek Emperor he (generally) demanded the permission of the Emperor to do so. He could hardly have done this if it were a mere piece of ecclesiastical dress not granted by imperial power. Similarly under Charles the Great the pallium was only given with consent of the Emperor (*D. C. B.*, i. 461).

As regards the relation of the Eastern omophorion and the Western pallium, no one who looks at them can doubt that they are substantially identical, and this identity appears in the monuments. See *e.g.* the figures of Gregory the Great in Braun

(fig. 295), and of Gregory of Nyssa, *ib.* fig. 302. There is scarcely room to believe that there was any practical difference, except it be that the Greeks wore their omophorion in a rather loose, old-fashioned and inconvenient manner, while the more practical Romans reduced the garment to an artificially symmetrical shape, and made it easier to put on and take off by making the central yoke all of one piece. The real difference seems to be first in the personality of the giver—the Pope, with his indefinite claims to possess and to be able to delegate authority—and secondly, the place from which the Roman pallium came, the tomb of St. Peter, above whose body it had rested for a night previous to its transmission, and from whom it was supposed to have contracted a share of apostolic authority.

It may be remarked that the pallium is the only article of ecclesiastical dress which law or custom in the Western Church forbids to be lent. The reason is obvious, viz. lest any unauthorised person should wear it. There is no such rule in the Eastern Church, and the present Archbishop of York received an omophorion as a present from the Russian Archbishop of Smolensk. It is about 10 inches broad and over 13 feet in length. Its front is made of cloth of silver lined with white silk. It is bordered with gold lace and adorned with gold ornaments. Nearly in the centre, *i.e.* about 7 feet from the end, the front leaves off and is transferred to the back. This is in order to enable it to be twisted round the neck and to hang down behind, yet always to present the front to view.²⁰

§ 5. *Other ornaments of a Bishop from the seventh century. The pastoral staff or crosier.*²¹ *The ring. The cross-staff. The pectoral cross.*

The use of a *staff* or *crosier* (*baculus*, *virga*, *ferula*, *pedum*, *cambuta*, *capuita*, *crocea*, &c.) has sometimes been ascribed to the fifth century from the misunderstanding of a passage in Pope

²⁰ Dr. Legg writes (*Blessing of the Pall*, p. 122): "The part which hangs down in front to the feet passes up over the left shoulder, behind the neck, over the right shoulder, and then down to the centre of the chest, where it is reversed before passing up again over the shoulder to hang down behind the back. The part which hangs in front is 83 inches long up to the place in front of the chest, where it is reversed; and the part which falls behind is 78 inches from the same place of reversion. The vestment is embroidered with four crosses, and on the longer piece of cloth of silver there is also a star which comes immediately behind the neck There are golden buttons and loops attached to the edges by means of which it is fastened so as to hang in its proper shape."

²¹ There is a good treatise in French *Le bâton pastoral*, by L'Abbé Barrault and Arthur Martin, S. J., extracted from tome iv. of *Mélanges d'Archéologie* Paris, 1856. Illustrations of the Irish crosiers may be found in Miss Margaret Stokes' *Early Christian Art in Ireland* (Chapman and Hall, Ltd.). For the "Staff of Jesus," see J. H. Todd's *St. Patrick*, pp. 323, 328 (1864), and his *Obits and Martyrology of Christ Church*, pp. viii.-xx. (1844).

Celestine's letter in 428 (above n. 2), who asks why bishops (if slaves to Scripture) do not carry "burning lights" held in their hands as well as "a staff." He implies really that they carried neither. But these ornaments are referred to in Canon 28 of the fourth Council of Toledo, as in general use in Spain in the first half of the seventh century. It is remarkable that Isidore of Seville, who presided at that Council, mentions them in his tract, *de eccl. officiis*, ii. 5, while he says nothing of the orarium or pallium. It is perhaps probable that he considered the latter more of a secular than an ecclesiastical ornament. He explains the two which he mentions as follows: "Datur baculus, ut eius indicio subditam plebem vel regat vel corrigat vel infirmitates infirmorum sustineat. Datur et anulus propter signum pontificalis honoris vel signaculum secretorum," implying by the latter the knowledge of divine mysteries. In 743 Pope Zacharias, at a Roman Council c.13, forbade a Bishop, Priest, or Deacon, to enter a church for mass with a staff, or to assist at the altar with covered head.

The earliest crosiers in this country are the Irish, some of which may possibly go back to the beginning of the ninth century. The most famous of those known in history, the "staff of Jesus," which was believed to have belonged to St. Patrick († circa 463), was unfortunately burnt in the sixteenth century. They are supposed by the Bishop (G. F. Browne) of Bristol, who has paid much attention to Celtic and British archæology, to have been originally long staves actually used in walking by the early itinerant Irish and Scottish Bishops. The piety of later ages treated them as relics, and endowed them with land, and left them in the charge of hereditary keepers, while the original sticks were generally enclosed in highly-worked cases of metal. The head of these crosiers is generally that of a crook, but there is one bronze tau-shaped head in the collection of the Royal Irish Academy, dated about 1100 A.D. (*Journal of R. I. A.* iii. pp. 55 and 157). Most of the Irish crosiers are described and figured in Miss Margaret Stokes' book mentioned in our note. Only one is actually preserved in Scotland, the Lismore *bachuil mor*, in the possession of the Duke of Argyll (fig. in *Origines Parochiales Scotie*, ii. part 1, p. 163), and the case of another called St. Fillan's (*Proceedings S. A. Scot.*, vol. xii. pp. 122, and xxiii. p. 110). The only early English staff is a miniature one of copper gilt and enamelled, exactly twelve inches high, found in a twelfth or thirteenth century coffin at Wells, and ascribed, without sufficient reason, to Savaric (W. H. St. John Hope in C. M. Church's *Early History of the Church of Wells*, Appendix P, and *Archæologia*, vol. xli. part 1, p. 106). Later crosiers of William of Wykeham, †1405, and Richard Fox, †1528, both of Winchester, are also preserved.

The use of a *ring* by Bishops, as bearing a personal or official seal, is no doubt very ancient. We find St. Augustine describing

such a seal on his ring, "qui exprimit faciem homines attendentis in latum" (*Ep. 217 ad Victorinum*). Other instances of the same character are given in Professor Churchill Babington's article *Rings* in the *Dict. of Christian Antiquities* s.v., which show that it was used for official documents. But the passage of Isidore already quoted is the earliest evidence of a liturgical use, such as the "Gregorian" Sacramentary and "Egbert" Pontifical describe. According to Roman usage the ring was worn on the ring-finger of the right hand. But to judge from those English effigies, which have preserved their hands, and which exhibit a ring (such as those of Hugh Patteshull, †1245, at Lichfield, and Giles de Bridport, †1263, at Salisbury), it was worn in England on the middle finger of the right hand, so that the ring-finger and little finger might be turned down in benediction. Since the time of Innocent III. (1198) the episcopal ring, worn liturgically, was directed to be made of gold and to have a stone or jewel without engraving. As regards the appearance of a ring on effigies or portraits, the finger on which it was worn, and the character of its ornamentation, exact information does not as yet appear to have been collected, and the whole subject might receive much fresh illustration. In England the ring given in consecration seems to have been a symbol like the chalice given to priests. Nevertheless, an episcopal ring or rings must have been a regular part of the property of our English Bishops, and it was one of the privileges of the see of Canterbury to receive the rings and seals of deceased Bishops of the province, all except the best ring (Parker's *De Antiquitate Brit. Eccles.* p 41, ed. Drake, 1729). In Parker's own inventory, taken in 1577 (*Archaeologia*, vol. xxx.), three rings are mentioned, one with a blue sapphire and two "Turkesses."

As regards the *cross-headed staff*, *cross-staff*, or *cross* of Archbishops it is interesting to notice that one appears in the diptych of Monza in the left hand of Gregory the Great (Marriott, pl. xxiv.), just as the diptych of Boethius as consul, A.D. 510, represents him with a baton surmounted by an eagle in his left hand. The right hand of both holds up the mappula (pl. xxii.). The use of a cross-staff by the Pope seems to have preceded its use by other dignitaries very much as that of the pallium and the mitre did. In quite early days a cross was often carried in processions, not so often perhaps by clergy as by other Christian folk. Its use in St. Augustine's procession to meet King Ethelbert is perhaps rather exceptional (Bede, *H. E.* i. 25). Thomassinus has collected a number of instances of the use of the cross by dignitaries, but his list needs criticism (*De benef.*, I. i. cc. 58, 59). It may perhaps be concluded that the cross-staff was first borne regularly before Popes in out-of-door processions, in which the *camelaucus* or *tiara* was worn by them on the head (see below

under *mitre*), from the latter part of the eighth century. It is in this century that we first find a cross-staff appearing as an emblem in English art on a coin of Archbishop Egbert of York (734-766) which is more particularly described below. From the Popes it gradually passed to their legates, and then to (Latin) patriarchs, exarchs, archbishops, and metropolitans. The document professing to be a grant of the use of cross and mitre by Leo IV. (847-855) to Archbishop Anschar of Hamburg is spurious. But a cross seems to have been borne before Cardinal Humbert on his entry into Constantinople in 1054, when he was sent to excommunicate the patriarch Michael Cerularius. The latter writes to Peter of Antioch: "Seipsos magnopere extollentes . . . cum cruce et sceptris regium ingrediuntur palatium" (Baronius, *Annales s. a.*, No. 30). In the twelfth century its use became much more general, and it figures largely in the life of our Archbishop Thomas Becket (1162-1170).

When used by an Archbishop the cross-staff is not properly a substitute for but an addition to the crosier, and it is carried before him, not by him. It is, however, found sometimes represented in the hands of an Archbishop on monumental effigies and seals. Thus it may be seen on brasses of Robert de Waldeby, York, †1397 in Westminster Abbey, and Thomas Cranley, Dublin, †1417, at New College, Oxford, in both of which it is in the left hand. On some German brasses one hand holds the cross-staff and the other the crosier. (See, for de Waldeby's brass, Macklin's *Brasses of England*, p. 106; for Cranley's, Druitt's *Costume on Brasses*, pp. 77, 78; for Albrecht von Brandenburg, Archbishop of Mainz and Magdeburg, †1545, who wears two palls and holds cross in his left hand and crosier in right, Macalister's *Ecclesiastical Vestments*, p. 101, and cp. pp. 124-5 and 130.)

We have not noticed both cross and crosier on English effigies or seals, but John Sharp, Archbishop of St. Andrews (1661-1679) is represented holding both, and Arthur Ross, his successor (1684-8, †1704), holds the cross of St. Andrew in his left hand and a crosier in his right (H. Laing's *Scottish Seals*, i. No. 890, 1850, and ii. No. 1011, 1866).

The use of a *Pectoral cross* (encolpion) as a private ornament, and sometimes as a reliquary, sometimes as a receptacle for the Eucharist, can be traced to the sixth century, and, perhaps, even earlier. (See *R. E. s.v. Enkolpien und Kreuzigung*). A remarkable cross, bearing a figure of our Lord clothed in a long sleeveless tunic, of the time of Gregory the Great, is preserved at Monza (l.c. fig. 97). This ornament, however, has been much more used by Bishops in the East than in the West. The only known instances in England before the nineteenth century are the crosses of St. Cuthbert (†686), found in his coffin and still preserved, St. Alphege (†1012), and possibly, but less probably,

St. Birinus († c. 650, see N. F. Robinson *The Black Chimere*, &c., quoted in § 7, p. 207, note). The effigy of Archbishop John Williams of York († 1650), at Llandegai near Bangor, seems, at first sight, to represent a pectoral cross just under his ruff. But this is really the head of his cross-staff, the point of which appears below the miniature pallium which is on his breast.

A pectoral crucifix has been long preserved at Lambeth Palace, with a chasuble, stole, and maniple, some marble beads of a rosary, a pair of bands marked with a P, and a corporale. Tradition, going back to the time of Archbishop Herring (1747-1757), supposes them to have belonged to Cardinal Pole "or one of his priests" (1555-8). But expert opinion assigns them to the latter part of the seventeenth century. The chasuble in its shape and in the arrangement of its seams, which are covered with braid, is almost exactly like that of which the back view is given by Braun, fig. 90, from Eichstätt.

The pectoral cross is treated by Innocent III. *de S. A. M.* i. 53, as one of the special insignia of the Bishop of Rome. At the Council of Florence it is said that no Western Bishops were allowed to wear one in the presence of the Pope, while the Greeks maintained their right to do so (Marriott, p. 153 n.). The *Ritus celebrandi missam*, i. 4, now says: "Si celebrans sit Episcopus . . . antequam accipiat Stolum, accipit parvam crucem pectoralem."

§ 6. *Other ornaments of a Bishop from the ninth century and later. Dalmatic and tunicle. Mitre (eleventh century). Its derivation from the papal processional head-dress. Gloves, shoes, &c. The Rationale (tenth and twelfth centuries).*

The *Dalmatic* was at first peculiar to the Pope and his deacons (p. 17, n. 18). Gregory I. in 599 gave two to Aregius Bishop of Gap, for himself and his archdeacon. Our Bertwald, c. 693, received from Sergius "pallii dalmaticaeque usum" as did Tatwin from Gregory III. c. 733. Walafrid Strabo, in the ninth century, writes that "now nearly all Bishops and some presbyters think they may wear the dalmatic under the chasuble." The sub-deacon's *tunicle* (also worn by Bishops) was shaped like a dalmatic, but was at first of linen, without ornament. It is not, however, reckoned as episcopal by Honorius (p. 105, n. 8), and it is not visible on many (if on any) of our early effigies.

The *Mitre* has an obscure history, but much light has been thrown on it, and many illusions with regard to it have been dispelled, by the elaborate dissertation of Braun (l. c. pp. 424-498), which is indispensable for a knowledge of the subject. He derives the mitre from the head-dress of the Pope worn at Rome in outdoor processions, apparently from the eighth century onwards (p. 496). It is first mentioned in the *Liber Pontificalis, Vita Constantini* (708-715), as worn by that Pope at his solemn entry into

Constantinople ("cum camelauco ut solitus est Roma procedere"). The next reference to it is in the spurious *Constitutum Constantini*, where Silvester is said to have declined the imperial crown offered to him, but to have received from Constantine's own hands the white *frigium* to be worn in processions (*Decretales* ed. Hinschius, p. 253, cp. Duchesne, *Origines*, p. 396). The name for this head-dress was, therefore, *camelaucum*, *frigium* (*Phrygium*) or *regnum*, and later *tiara*, and it is described as like a helmet (*cassis*), but made of white linen. It was conical in shape, sometimes tall like an extinguisher, sometimes in section an equilateral triangle. It is a very remarkable fact that the earliest appearance of a mitre in art, as yet recorded, is on a coin of Egbert Archbishop of York (734-766). It is rather like a very high-crowned cocked hat, and is on the head of a figure standing and holding from two cross-staves, one in either hand, the idea being taken from the common Roman imperial type of a figure holding two standards. On the reverse is the name of his brother, Edberht, King of Northumbria. Mr. H. A. Grueber of the British Museum, who has kindly supplied this information, is of opinion that the figure is that of St. Peter rather than of the Archbishop (cp. C. F. Keary, *A. S. Coins*, &c.—under the name of R. S. Poole of the British Museum—i. pp. 140, 189, pl. xx. 3, xxiii. 1). According to Braun the mitre first appears on Roman coins in the pontificates of Sergius III. (904-911) and Benedict VII. (974-983), and on the head not of the Pope but St. Peter. About the same time it appears again, but as an isolated triangular emblem, with two labels on coins of York. That no liturgical head-dress was used before A.D. 900 is clear, not only from the decree of Pope Zacharias (p. 20), but from Pseudo-Alcuin's *de divinis officiis* c. 38, treating of the Jewish high priest's *tiara*: "Huiuscemodi vestis non habetur in Romana ecclesia vel in nostris regionibus. Non enim moris est ut pileati divina mysteria celebrent. Apud graecos autem hoc dicitur, qui pileos, id est cuphias gestant in capite dum assistant altaribus." He only speaks of the Greeks by hearsay, and the history of their *camelaucium* is still a matter of some obscurity.

The transformation of an article of official out-door dress into an in-door liturgical ornament is easy to understand, and we have numerous instances of such a change, of which the chasuble or planeta is most obvious. It is perhaps more remarkable that it required nearly two centuries after A.D. 900 to make the mitre a common liturgical ornament. An interesting intermediate step may be traced in our own country in the Benedictional of Aethelwold and in the crown (pileus regius auro tectus) offered by King Athelstan to the body of St. Cuthbert A.D. 934. In the Benedictional St. Benedict is depicted in glory with a fascia or fillet round his hair and a crown in his left hand (*Archaeologia*, vol. xxiv. pl. 30, 1832), and in another picture, where he is in company

with Gregory the Great and St. Cuthbert, all three are dressed as Bishops, all are crowned, and all wear the pallium (*ib.* pl. 3, cp. Braun, p. 437). This is of course the artist's idea of their heavenly glory, and is in no sense historical. The same idea probably prompted the gift of the "pileus regius auro tectus" with which St. Cuthbert's body was decorated, as with other precious vestments of which fragments are still preserved (cp. James Raine's *St. Cuthbert*, pp. 51, 212-213, 1828). But none of these, with the exception of the cross, seems to have been earlier than the tenth century. A similar idea of representing heavenly glory is discernible in the picture of St. Dunstan in the eleventh century in the Cotton MS., Claudius A, 3 (figured in Macalister, *Eccles. Vestments*, pp. 97, 116, 1896). He is represented as seated on a throne with a nimbus round his head which bears a mitre (in the shape of a nearly flat pileus), with ribbons. A dove whispers in his ear. Two monks kneeling kiss his feet, and a third is adoring below them.

These facts, then, are no evidence that Egbert, Cuthbert, or Dunstan, or any English prelate living even in the tenth century, wore a cap or crown in church or even a fascia or fillet round his hair. The gloss sometimes quoted as from Aelfric, "infula, Biscop heafod lin," is not found in Zupitza's careful edition, Berlin, 1880. In fact the bare head was the rule in the Church of England both before and some time after the Norman Conquest as elsewhere.²² The head of Stigand Archbishop of Canterbury (1052-1070) is represented on the almost contemporary Bayeux tapestry, where he is assisting in his pontificals at the coronation of Harold, as absolutely bare. And in the see of which the relics of St. Cuthbert were the greatest treasure there is evidence, both from seals and mortuary lists of ornaments taken by the Abbots of Durham, that Bishops up to and including Ralph Flambard (1099-1128) and Galfrid Rufus (1133-1140) had no mitre or liturgical head-covering. There is no record for William of St. Barbara, but Hugh Pudsey (1153-1194) has a mitre on his seal nearly like an equilateral triangle with a ribbon hanging over each ear (James Raine, *Auckland Castle*, p. 8 foll. 1852). There are, however, earlier seals, viz., those of St. Anselm (1093-1109) and his successor Ralph d'Escures of Canterbury (1114-22), Thurston of York (1114-40), and a few others such as those of Alexander of Lincoln (1123-48), and Simon of Worcester (1125-

²² The only exceptions known to us are coins of two Archbishops of Canterbury, Ceolnoth and Aethred, which are diademed (C. F. Keary's *Anglo-Saxon Coins of British Museum*, i. pp. 77-8, pl. xiii. 8, 9, 1887); but these are said to be copied from the head of a king of Mercia, Burhed (*ib.* p. 46, pl. x. 9, 15). The mitre represented on the coins of the "city of York" is of the Danish period, A.D. 919-940, with the name of St. Peter, and his sword on the other side (pl. xxx. 2, 3).

50), which show that the use of the mitre at Durham began (by comparison) rather late. In any case the mitre did not become common in England until about seventy-five years later than the first recorded instance when in 1049 Pope Leo IX. put a mitre on the head of Eberhard of Treves with the words: "Romana mitra caput vestrum insignivimus qua et vos et successores vestri in ecclesiasticis officiis Romano more utamini" (*Ep.* 3 in *P. L.* 143, 703). It was not, however, confined to Bishops.

There seems to have been practically no difference between the earliest forms of the papal *tiara* and the mitre. Both were at first conical, as may be seen in the figures given by Braun, esp. 214, 216, 218, 254, for Bishops, and 247 (the "Exultet roll" of Bari) and 249 (fresco of St. Silvester riding) for the Pope. The gradual development of the mitre to the present day is well explained by figure 234, though we may well doubt whether the succession of types was always the same. On seals of Archbishops of Canterbury the earliest type from Anselm (1093-1109) to Baldwin (1184-90) is a low cap with a crescent-shaped depression over the forehead. Then there is for a time a return to the helmet shape. The conical or extinguisher shape seems to have reappeared again in the fifteenth century as on the effigy of Cardinal Alanus in St. Prassede at Rome, † 1474 (Braun, fig. 254), and on a figure of St. Thomas Becket in some glass in the south chapel of Mere, Wilts. Personal fancy, as opposed to regular development, had, perhaps, more play in such matters than modern systematisers would wish to allow. We may add that the differentiation of the papal head-dress by the addition of a crown (afterwards a triple crown) to the tiara, about the eleventh century, may very naturally have been connected with the extended use of that head-dress by which it became a mitre in the same century.²³

As regards the head-band or fillet, with pendant fringed ends, it is to be noticed that it is by no means a necessary part of the mitre, see figs. 214, 215, 216, 218, 219. Braun is more inclined to treat these head-bands as mere ornaments, such as are found attached to secular caps, than as imitations of an ancient Persian diadem. They may have been intended to keep the cap tight to the forehead, like the cord of the oriental keffiyeh (cuphia, coif). The pictures from the Benedictional of Aethelwold, however, suggest that the head-band was considered in the tenth century as something distinct from the crown.

The word *mitra* may either have been used in the sense of cap or head-dress as a word of common life, or (more probably)

²³ A double crown seems first found in the case of Boniface VIII. (1294-1303); the triple crown begins shortly after, being described in an inventory of A.D. 1315-6. The first papal monument exhibiting a triple crown is, however, that of Benedict XII. (1334-1342), the remains of which are in the Museum at Avignon. See Braun, pp. 502-4 and fig. 251,

as having been employed in the Latin Old Testament for the head-dress of the Jewish Priests (l.c. p. 461).

A *scull-cap* (*pileolus, submitrale*) is found figured on monuments of the fourteenth century onwards under the tiara or mitre. It was more like the close-fitting cap with ear flaps often figured on later effigies of English Bishops, which covered the back of the head as well as the scull. See Braun, figs. 253, 254.

Gloves (*chirothecae*) are not mentioned as part of episcopal dress before the twelfth century. *Shoes* or sandals (*campagi, sandalia*) are older as part of official dress. *Buskins* or stockings (*caligae, tibialia*) are mentioned comparatively late by Ivo and Innocent III. The burse or book-pocket of Eastern Bishops (*epigonation, hypogonation*) seems never to have been used officially in the West.

The *Rationale*.—This much-debated ornament is fully discussed by Braun, pp. 676-700. It signifies an episcopal decoration given to or worn by Bishops of distinction who had not the right to use the pallium, and it is used of two different kinds of ornament. The *first* is a highly ornamented covering for the breast and back (a *superhumale*), which is still worn by the Bishops of Eichstätt, Cracow, Paderborn, and Toul, and of which a number of old examples are preserved. The earliest reference to it is met with in the latter part of the tenth century in a correspondence between the Bishops of Metz and Halberstadt (l. c. p. 678). It seems to have been worn at one time by many German Bishops. The *second* is a much smaller ornament of the breast, more distinctly answering to the High-Priestly *λογεῖον*, of which the word *rationale* is a translation, which is found represented on a much larger number of monuments of Bishops, both in England and elsewhere, roughly speaking, between the years 1180 and 1280. No actual examples of this are preserved. Many explanations of these ornaments have been given, but there is still some obscurity surrounding them.

§ 7. *Later vestments of the clergy generally. Amice (ninth century); surplice (eleventh century). The almuce (twelfth century), the hood, scarf or tippet, and cap are all derived from the birrus. The rochet (thirteenth century); the chimere (fourteenth century) and cassock.*

The *Amice* (*amictus, humerale, superhumale, &c.*) appears first in liturgical writers of the ninth century, some of whom compare it with the ephod of the Old Testament. It no doubt existed before their time. There is some evidence that it was worn at one time over the head,²⁴ as well as (at present) over the neck and

²⁴ Braun's fig. 4. He does not, however, believe that it was really used as a cowl, p. 31. Some of the prayers, *e.g.* the present Roman prayer for vesting, speak of it as a "helmet": "Impone, Domine, capiti meo galeam salutis ad expugnandos diabolicos incursus." This is part of the teaching of the "allegorical" school. See below § 8. Dr. Legg writes (*Tracts on the Mass* H.B.S.

shoulders and back; and indeed it may well have been adopted as a protection from draughts in the unwarmed churches of early mediæval times, as well as generally a protection of the church vestments from being soiled by coming too near the skin. It is mentioned by Amalarius as the first of the vestments put on in robing for service. Sometimes it was worn over the alb, but it is now worn under it, as apparently it was in the eighth century. It is a square piece of linen tied with strings, over the breast, and under the arms and round the body.

The *Surplice* is a kind of alb, but with ample and open sleeves, larger than those of the ancient dalmatic, and without a girdle. It was worn over a pelisse or thick cassock of skin, or indeed any kind of cassock, and was suitable for use with a cope, while the alb, having sleeves tight at the wrists, was convenient for the manual acts required to be done in the Liturgy. The word *superpellicium* appears somewhat late, perhaps as late as the eleventh or twelfth century. It was naturally first in use among the Northern nations, and perhaps the earliest mention of it is in a law attributed to our Edward the Confessor (C. 36 *de latronibus interfectis* in Thorpe *Anc. Laws*, i. 460, ed. 1840. Cf. Braun, *Liturgische gewandung*, pp. 140-2, 1907.) Dr. Legg, however, reminds us of the linen tunics on the Ravenna mosaics, which are of course several centuries earlier.

The *Almuce*, *aumuce*, or *amess*, has often been confounded with the *amice*. (See the instances given, under the same spelling *Amice*, in Murray's *Oxford Dictionary*.) Both indeed were sometimes head-coverings, and both are or were worn round the shoulders. But the origin of the two words is quite distinct, and while the *amice* is the lowest liturgical under-vestment for all priests, the *almuce* is a choir-vestment especially worn by canons over the surplice but under the cope. *Amice* is, as we have seen, from *amictus*; *almuce* is a word apparently of Teutonic origin, which has attracted to itself the Arabic definite article *al*, probably in Spain²⁵ The first notices of it seem to be in the twelfth century.²⁶ At first it was practically a small birrus, with a cowl for the head. Then it became a hood, with short pendant wings, like a judge's full-bottomed wig (Braun, fig. 169, cf. fig. 57, for a larger one). Then it was little more than a cap. A good

p. 237, 1904): "There seems good evidence that the amice was worn on the head in England." Amongst the quotations which follow he refers to Sir Thomas More: "The peple pull the priest from the aulter, and the amis from his head" (*Workes*, fo. 641, col. 2, F, Lond. 1537).

²⁵ See Diez, *Etymol. Wörterbuch* s.v. *Almussa*. Its shorter forms may be seen in the German *Mütze*, a cap, Spanish *muceta*, and Italian *mozzetta*. For further information about the *almuce* see Prof. E. C. Clark, *English Acadamical Costume* in *Arch. Journal* 50, p. 73 foll., and the papers of *S. Paul's Eccl. Soc.*

²⁶ So in Radewicus, *de Gestis Friderici Imp.* ii. 67. quoted by Ducange, and a grant of Alexander III. to the monks of S. Germain du Pré, Martene, iv. p. 13.

example of the cap form of the date of 1514 is given by Braun (fig. 170) from a monument in Bamberg Cathedral. But usually in the later middle age it had retreated from the head to the shoulders, as a sort of deep fur collar, coming down over the neck and shoulders to the elbows, with two long pendants, often called "cats' tails," in front. Its place as a cap was taken by the biretta, or "little birrus" which came into vogue from about 1450. The almuce is well represented on monumental effigies in this country, e.g. on the brass of a Prebendary John Moore, A.D. 1532, in Sibson Church, Leicestershire (Bloxam, *Vestments*, p. 75), on the effigy of Bishop Blyth, †1499, in Salisbury Cathedral, and another in St. Martin's Church, Birmingham. Others are described and figured in Macklin's *Brasses*, pp. 116-120, 1907, Druitt's *Costume on Brasses*, pp. 86-89, 93, &c., 1906, and others in Belcher's *Kentish Brasses*, Nos. 150 and 179, 1888. In 1549 the grey almuce of the canons of St. Paul's was put down, and the use of the academic hood, with which it had a certain affinity, was substituted for it. It was again put down in 1559, and finally forbidden by the (unratified) canons of 1571. What the objection to it was is difficult to ascertain.

Much has recently been written in the third, fourth, and fifth volumes of *S. Paul's Ecclesiological Society* by Dr. Legg, Rev. T. A. Lacey, Rev. N. F. Robinson, and Mr. Cuthbert Atchley, and in the *Archæological Journal*, vols. 50 and 61 (in the latter on *College Caps and Doctors' Hats*) by Prof. E. C. Clark, on the cognate subjects of *Almuces*, *Hoods*, *Tippets*, *Caps*, and other articles of clerical and academical dress. The mass of detail presented by these writers is so great that it is impossible to summarise it in the space at our command. Nor is it very necessary to our task to do so, or to summarise Dr. Braun's interesting section, *Das Birett*, pp. 510-4. A few conclusions, however, may be selected as important:

(1) That all these, including the cap (the *pileus* or *biretum* or *birettum*), are derived more or less directly from the old birrus;

(2) That the round and the four-cornered cap were originally the same, the upper part being a diminutive head-piece of a birrus, while the under part, which covers the back of the scull and sometimes the ears, was the collar of the same greatly diminished. The four corners of the *pileus quadratus* or cater-cap are simply the cross-seams of the *pileus rotundus* somewhat exaggerated and finally stiffened by the cap-makers;

(3) That the *almuce* and the *hood* were cognate, and alternatives in clerical dress (see *Statute* 8 of Lincoln College, Oxford, A.D. 1480, p. 271, 1853);

(4) That the *tippet* (or scarf) and *hood* were also alternatives, and certainly not usually worn together as now;

(5) That the tippet or scarf began to be worn round the neck,

for comfort or dignity, about the middle of the 15th century, when it began to receive the name *liripipium*, which had previously been generally used for a caudal appendage to the hood (*Council of London* 1463, Wilkins, 3, 586—in which the word is used in both senses). Good examples of a tippet of silk or stuff worn over the surplice are on the brass of William Dye, Parson of Tatsfield † 1567, in the Church of St. Mary, Westerham, Kent, (*Hierurgia*, iii. pl. 4, p. 143), and on the incised slab of Archdeacon Edward Cooper, † 1596, at Ledbury (Bloxam p. 275).

(6) That the use of hoods (*epomides* or *caputia*) with the surplice in public worship of the Church of England is limited to Graduates by Canon 58 of 1604, and that the use of *tippets* (*liripipia*) is alternative to it, and conceded to non-graduate Ministers. It follows that, according to this canon, non-graduates should wear a scarf in Church, and graduates should not. According to the English version of Canon 74 graduates are to wear, as part of their ordinary apparel, "Hoods and Tippets (*caputiis vel liripipiis*) of silk or sarcenet with square caps." But in the English "and" seems a mistake for "or."

(7) In order to complete this branch of our subject we may mention that the hood and tippet were sometimes worn together in the fifteenth century. Instances are given by Druitt, *Costume on Brasses*, p. 104. In later times the effigy of Archbishop Sandys, † 1588, at Southwell, seems to have both hood and tippet; so have the busts of Thomas Thornton, † 1629 and John Hoskyns, † 1631, at Ledbury. Thornton's tippet seems to be worn something like a necktie (or pallium) down the middle of his breast. Hoskyns' is over both arms, but it does not appear on the shoulders. In Bishop Montague's *Visitation Questions* for Norwich, v. 16, 1638 (*Rit. Comm.* 2, 582), we read: "Doth your Minister officiate divine service in one place . . . in the habit and apparel of his order, with a Surplice, an Hood, a Gown, a Tippet; not in a cloak, &c.?" The wearing of hood and tippet together seems to be part of the combination of ministerial and academic dress, which has a certain degree of ancient custom in its favour, though not canonical rule, or it may be entire "correctness."

It follows from all this that a man who wears a cap, a hood, and a tippet is wearing at once three kinds of birrus.

The *Rochet* is distinguished from the surplice in that being, relatively speaking, an under-vestment it has narrower sleeves. The sleeved rochet can only be worn, according to modern usage, by higher ministers of the Church. It is rather a choral or public than a liturgical vestment. It is in fact the foundation of a Bishop's dress. The word, which is a diminutive of the earlier *roccus*, is hardly found before the thirteenth century. Like the surplice it seems to have been of very early use in England, being found in inventories of the diocese of Salisbury about the time of the

foundation of the present cathedral in the episcopate of Richard Poore (A.D. 1220: see Braun, l. c. p. 127). It was perhaps introduced in order to fulfil the decree of the fourth Lateran Council A.D. 1215: "Pontifices in publico et in ecclesia superindumentis lineis utantur, nisi monachi fuerint." It is difficult to perceive the difference between the alb and the rochet except that the latter was never girdled. A rochet attributed to Archbishop Becket is preserved at Arras (Braun, fig. 55) which may be compared with the illustrations of albs in the same book, fig. 27 following. The only further difference seems to be that the sleeves of the alb, as being put on over the rochet or under-tunic, are necessarily gored at the base to allow play for the arms. It has been remarked by Mr. Marriott, l. c. p. 226 n. 466, that Lyndwood asserts that a rochet was without sleeves (*Provinciale*, iii. 27, on a Constitution of Robert Winchilsea). This is perfectly true of the kind of rochet there specified, which was one of the things to be provided by the parish priest, but it is no doubt correctly explained in the gloss as for the clerk who was to minister to the priest, or perhaps for the use of the priest himself in baptising children, lest his arms should be impeded by the sleeves (of the surplice). Such a sleeveless rochet or surplice is often used by us for organists, and would be a very natural dress for a parish clerk.

The *chimere* (Latin, *chimera*, *crimera*, *chimaera*; French, *chamarre*, *simarre*; Italian, *zimarra*; Spanish, *zamarra*, &c.). In describing this garment use has been made of the learned paper in the *Transactions of the St. Paul's Ecclesiological Society* by Rev N. F. Robinson, *The black chimere of Anglican Prelates: a plea for its retention and proper use* (1898), vol. iv. pp. 181-220; but an independent judgment has been exercised on the material there collected.²⁷

The word is supposed by Diez to be of Spanish, and perhaps Basque, origin, and to mean originally a sheepskin pelisse or house-coat. The Spanish *zamarra* still means a pelisse. In English it goes back to the fourteenth century. It is used for two garments, (1) a sleeved cassock worn under the sleeved rochet, and (2) a sleeveless upper garment, generally worn open in front, but capable of being closed by turning back the lappets. When so closed it would be exactly like a double-breasted sleeveless cassock. It seems, however, to have been sometimes made wholly closed in front to within a few inches of the neck-band of the rochet, as is the case with the

²⁷ Mr. Robinson is in error in saying that Bishop Hooper wore a scarlet chimere at his consecration. He was consecrated in the dress worn by the assisting Bishops, viz. a cope and linen surplice, as Cranmer's *Register*, fol. 332, states: see below, Chapter III. § 3. No doubt (like Parker) he put on his rochet and chimere, as his out-of-door dress or habit, *after* his consecration, and he also preached in it on the occasions mentioned by Strype.

effigies of Bishop Rudd of St. David's † 1614, at Llangathen, and Bishop Bennett, † 1617, in Hereford Cathedral. This garment is apparently the same as the academic tabard, and therefore was not peculiar to prelates. It belongs to the same class of close-fitting garments as the tunic, colobium, dalmatic, and cassock, not to that of "overalls" like the cope and chasuble. It is in fact an over-coat.²⁸ But, like the cope and chasuble, it is properly an outdoor dress, and like them it has in practice among ourselves become an indoor liturgical dress, which for Bishops has for several centuries almost superseded and generally taken the place of both cope and chasuble. A similar change has taken place in the Eastern Church, where a long-sleeved dalmatic, the sakkos, has largely superseded the phelonion for Bishops.

The colour of the chimere was by no means always black, and, if academic usage is to be followed, it would be right, on days when scarlet is worn, to wear a scarlet cassock with sleeves, and over it a rochet with sleeves, and over that the scarlet sleeveless chimere. Further over that again might be worn (or as a substitute for it) a scarlet cope with white fur hood, such as is still worn at the universities and by Bishops in the House of Lords at the opening of Parliament. But scarlet and black were by no means the only colours used for the chimere or tabard. Archbishop Scrope was beheaded wearing a blue under chimere; and green, violet, and murrey, &c., are all mentioned as colours of the chimere (l.c. pp. 194-97). Cranmer is represented in a dark green chimere in his portrait by Gerbicus Flicius, now in the National Portrait Gallery, dated 1546, perhaps as a Doctor of Divinity (ib. 216).

Finally we may mention the *cassock* which we have incidentally described as a sleeved under-chimere or tabard. Some of its equivalents are *camisia vestis*, *toga talaris*, *tunica talaris*, *vestis promissa*, *vestis subtanea* or *subtana*; It., *sottana*; Fr., *soutane*. For the word itself and its Italian, Spanish, and French forms *casacca*, *casaca*, and *casaque* (derived, no doubt, like *casula*, from *casa*=a house) belong rather to civil and domestic use. It was a long coat with rather tight sleeves, with skirts at first reaching to the heels, and in use both by men and women, and the name in early English is specially applied to the dress worn by soldiers and horsemen. See Murray's *Dictionary*, s.v., and Macalister's *Eccl. Vestments*, p. 138, 1896. The use of the word *cassock* as an ecclesiastical term is rather late. It is found in Canon 74 of 1604, commenting on which Mr. Mackenzie Walcot says that "*Cassock* in the time of Henry VIII. replaced the old name of *subtanea* or *vestis talaris*."

²⁸ A correspondent writes: "It is almost exactly the everyday dress of Bishops in Lombardy. There is a large photograph of the Bishop of Novara hanging in the steamboat station at Intra, on Lake Maggiore, which might almost be that of an English Bishop, excepting that the sleeves of the rochet are not so full and not so tight at the wrists, and there is too much chain about the pectoral cross."

But he gives no authority for the statement. The usual name in the late mediæval period in England was apparently *toga talaris* or *tunica talaris*. When so long a garment was felt to be inconvenient in civil life it remained not unnaturally in use by ecclesiastics, who moved with more leisure and dignity than other citizens. The cassock may of course have been worn under the long alb as part of liturgical costume, but in such a case it is hardly apparent in an effigy. It is, however, constantly visible in those effigies or brasses of ecclesiastics, which represent them either in the cassock by itself or in their choir dress of surplice and almuce, with or without the cope. Many examples are figured or referred to by M. H. Bloxam, *Vestments*, pp. 66-81, Herbert Druitt's *Costume on Brasses* pp. 85, 103-107, and H. W. Macklin, *Brasses of England*, pp. 115 foll. This usage can be traced up to about A.D. 1400.

It may be added that the double-breasted cassock is the old form in England. The continental single-breasted cassock with a long row of small buttons was, it is said, first introduced by Bishop Harris of Llandaff, 1729-38 (Walcot, l.c. p. 105 n). The band or girdle round the waist may perhaps be a modern convenience. See, however, Druitt's *Costume, &c.*, p. 103, for an early instance of buttons and a girdle on a cassock (circa A.D. 1400). The oriental caftan, which is practically the same garment, is also girdled.

§ 8. *The symbolism of liturgical costume.*²⁹ *Early speculations. Three later schools: (1) the moralizing school of Amalarius (ninth century); (2) the Christological school. Rupert of Deutz and Innocent III. Its later development looking to Christ's passion. Augsburg Missal of 1555; (3) the allegorical school: the priest a champion. Absence of any authoritative interpretation. Explanation of the ornaments on the chasuble.*

§ 8. We have already stated that the mystical interpretations of liturgical costume are artificial. By this we do not mean to throw discredit on the use of the religious imagination to attach pious associations of ideas to vestments in sacred use, but to assert that this imagination was employed, and employed freely and fancifully, upon vestments already adopted for other reasons, and was not the moving cause for their adoption. Even the peculiar ornamentation of these articles of dress was very rarely the fruit of such speculation or interpretation.

²⁹ Braun has written at length on this subject (l.c. pp. 701-727), and in an interesting and convincing manner. The texts of many of the liturgical writers have been conveniently extracted by Marriott, and form the principal and central part of his book (pp. 1-174). Extracts from St. Germanus of Paris are given at Appendix D, pp. 204-5. Most of the later treatises are printed at length by Hittorp, but not that of Innocent III. *mysteriorum Evangelicæ legis et Sacramenti Eucharistiæ libri sex*, generally called *de sacro altaris mysterio* (P. L. 217, pp. 763-916).

We have already mentioned some early instances of such pious imaginations, the oldest being that of Isidore of Pelusium, c. 412, in regard to the linen scarf or stole of deacons and the woollen omophorium (pallium) of bishops. The sixth century gives us the epistles of Germanus of Paris, which can hardly have been the first treatise of the kind, and the canon of St. Martin of Braga (c. 580), which connects the tunica talaris with Aaronic vesture. Germanus makes a more detailed attempt to connect Christian with Levitical vestments, and to give them a symbolical meaning; thus *e.g.* white garments signify exultation and the chasuble unity of doctrine, while the pallium is connected with Isaiah lxi. 3, "pallium laudis pro spiritu maeroris." Bede, however, early in the eighth century, in his *de tabernaculo*, still occupies himself only with Old Testament symbolism, though a transference of such symbolism to Christian dress would have been quite opportune and easy for him if it had been part of the teaching of his age and country.

It is not until the period of the Carolingian revival in the latter part of the eighth and in the ninth century that we find a regular treatment of this topic, a treatment which, with various checks and changes, has continued up to the present day. Three schools of interpretation may be distinguished in the writers who have dealt with the subject, which may also be illustrated by the prayers set down in various liturgical books for use in blessing or conferring the vestments, or on the occasions of vesting. The three schools may be distinguished as the *moralizing*, the *Christological*, and the *allegorical* schools.

(1) The first and oldest is the *moralizing school*, which we may call, from its principal exponent, that of Amalarius. It was not, however, founded by him, but owes its initiation to the famous Abbot of Fulda and Archbishop of Mainz, Rabanus Maurus (c. 776-856). By this school the vestments are explained as typical of the moral virtues suitable to the status and character of those who wear them. But though they agree in this general principle, and though their writings have had great and continued influence up to a much later age and even to the present day, they do not by any means agree with one another in the details of their interpretation. A few instances will show the uncertain and artificial character of this method. The *amice* is explained by Rabanus as the symbol of good works, by Amalarius as the government of the tongue, by Pseudo-Alcuin as the freedom of the body from all sin. The *alb* is to Rabanus the symbol of continence and chastity, to Amalarius (from its length) the government of the feet (*castigatio pedum*), to Ps. Alcuin perseverance in good action. To Rabanus the *girdle* is "*custodia mentis*," to Ps. Alcuin discretion. To Rabanus and Ps. Alcuin the *chasuble* is charity, which is a general covering, and to Amalarius (as we have

already seen) it represents the good works common to all clerks. It would be easy to enumerate the diverse interpretations offered by other authors of these and other vestments.

In our own country we find Lydgate (c. 1375-1460) in his *Vertue of the Mass* following this school in the lines headed *The morallisacioun of the prist when he goth to masse*. The *amyte* appears to be a sign of faith, the *awbe* of righteousness, the *girdle* of cleanness and chastity, the *phanon* of soberness with humility, the *stole* of the angels' doctrine, the *chasuble* charity. He then proceeds, adopting the language of the allegorical school:—

“ A prist made stronge . withe this armure
 A fore the Awtier . as cristis champioun
 Shal stonde upright . make no discomfiture
 Owre thre enemyes . venquysshē and bere downe
 The flesshe, the world . Sathan the felle dragoun.”

(Quoted in T. F. Simmons' *Lay-Folks' Mass-book*, p. 167-8, London E. E. Text Soc. 1879).

(2) The second, or *Christological school*, was that which considered the minister as the representative of Christ and his garments as typical of some aspects of His person or office. The earliest members of it explain the vestments as symbolising His Incarnation, His two natures, their unity and relation to one another, the virtues of our Holy Redeemer, His teaching and His relation to the Church. Its founder is considered to be Rupert of Deutz (c. 1075-1135: cf. Braun, p. 705), but its clearest exponents are Sicardus Bishop of Cremona (†1215) and Innocent III. writing before his elevation to the Papacy (1198). To the latter, e.g. the *alb* “novitatem vitae significat quam Christus et habuit et docuit et tribuit in baptismo” (*de S. A. M.* i. 36). The girdle is Christ's charity (*ib.* 37); the stole His obedience and servitude for our sakes (*ib.* 38); the tunic *poderis* “caelestem Christi doctrinam insinuat” (*ib.* 39); the dalmatic signifies His broad and large mercy (*ib.* 40); the gloves, His putting on the likeness of sin and human affections and passions (*ib.* 41); while the chasuble represents the universal Church, its front part the ancient Church, its back the new (*ib.* 42).

A second branch or extension of this school, which became very popular in the Middle Ages, treated the vestments as symbolic of the chains, bonds, and fetters, the purple robe and the cross of our suffering Redeemer. This later method of interpretation dates from the thirteenth century, and was naturally connected with the attempt then made to interest the people in the Liturgy, and especially to bring out its character as a representation of the sacrifice of Christ. But nothing in this method goes beyond the principle of St. Cyprian's remark about the priest: “vice Christi vere fungitur.”

We may quote (from Braun, p. 727), with the slightest possible changes of spelling and punctuation, the summary of this method of interpretation given in an Augsburg Missal of 1555 :—

Tu quicumque voles missam celebrare sacerdos,
 Et quicumque voles tantis assistere sacris,
 Sis memor, et tota devotus mente revolve,
 Qualia sit Christus pro te certamina passus.
 Velatum capite et derisum signat amictus :
 Linea vestis item quod sit despectus in alba :
 Vincula significant fera tortaque zona manipulus :
 Est stola imago crucis, quam humeris gestavit Iesus.
 Cernis amictu, atque inde quater tu cernis in alba,
 Signa terebrati capitis, manuumque pedumque.
 Purpureae, spectans casulam, vestis memor esto,
 Et rubeo ut fuerit perfusus sanguine Christus.
 Cumque sacerdotem properantem cernis ad aram,
 Tunc animo volvas memori ut conscenderit ultro
 Calvariae montem moriturus de cruce pro te.
 Omnia dicta pie memorando pectora tunde.

From our own country we may refer to Langforde's *Meditation in the time of the Mass* (Henry Bradshaw Soc. *Tracts on the Mass*, p. 19 foll. 1904), in which both sides of the Christological teaching are represented. In the *Rationale* drawn up in this country apparently in 1540, but suppressed by Cranmer, and first printed by Collier, *E. H.*, ii. 191-8, and Strype, *Eccl. Mem.*, i. 279-295, we find reference made to the teaching of the second Christological School "as touching the mystery," and to that of the moralising school "as touching the minister" for each article of liturgical dress.

(3) The third school may be called the *allegorical*, and, like the second, it had its origin in the twelfth century. It treats the priest as a warrior or champion, who puts on the amice as a helmet, the alb as a breastplate, the stole as a lance, the girdle as a bow, the chasuble as a shield, &c., &c., cf. Durandus in Marriott, p. 165, and Lydgate's lines quoted under (1).

The divergence between these schools is obvious, and is indicative of the fact that none of them had any authority; nor can it be said that there is any more unity of interpretation in the ancient prayers used in regard to the different articles of vesture. It would be absurd to attempt to fasten any of these fanciful speculations upon the ancient church vestments, and to assert that those who use them thereby become bound to uphold the interpretations of one or other of these schools, or of any of the prayers anciently or at present in use in regard to them. There is indeed nothing in these prayers implying any special dogmatic attitude towards the

mysteries of the faith. They play upon the same circle of imaginations as the treatises of the schools above described, and do not commit even those who use them to any specially Roman conceptions of the sacrament. They are pious and mystical, vague, fanciful, and poetical, not dogmatic. Specimens are given below in § 10.

In conclusion, we may find a place here for indicating what we believe to be the true explanation of certain forms of ornament on the chasuble, usually called orphreys, which sometimes are supposed to be symbolical. It seems probable that the phelonion or planeta was originally a flat piece of cloth, at first perhaps square, then rounded off at the corners, but always with a hole in the centre for the head. No seam appears on the mosaics at Thessalonica, perhaps the earliest representations of it in art (Texier and Pullan, *Byzantine Architecture*, followed by Marriott, plates xviii. to xxi.). But, after a time, when it was made of precious stuff, it was found convenient and economical to make it of a semi-circular piece, which was folded in two so as to form a quadrant, the two edges of which quadrant were united by a seam from the circumference to the centre with the exception of a small portion left for the head. The garment so constructed would be a kind of truncated cone, or bell. The seam up the front would naturally lend itself to ornament. This frontal seam is generally called the "pillar." But as time went on it was found still more economical to have more seams, and to sew two quadrant-shaped pieces together. The way in which the Y cross and the T cross, and the "double pillar" arose have been well explained by Mr. George Gilbert Scott in his *Discursus on the History of the Chasuble*, in his *Essay on the History of English Church Architecture*, pp. 113-8, 1881. Without accepting his opinion that the original form of the phelonion was semi-circular, we accept his general principle that the ornaments of the chasuble are simply decorated seams introduced from motives of economy. A similar conclusion may be drawn from figs. 70, 71, 74, 76, 79, 87, etc., in Braun. See also Dr. Legg's paper, *On Two Unusual Forms of Linen Vestments*, *S. Paul's E. S.*, iv. p. 146 and note, in which he notices the absence of all orphreys from many of the chasubles represented in English art. On the interesting priest's effigy of the thirteenth century in Ledbury Church the seams are covered by rather narrow tapes quite plain. It is figured (rather too strongly) by Bloxam, p. 45.

§ 9. *The origin and meaning of liturgical colours.*³⁰ *White the festal colour, esp. for Easter: prescribed early in Egypt for general use. Use of black for mourning. Freedom of usage in the East. Black or dark prescribed circa 800 for Good Friday, &c. Beginning of rules for colours in twelfth century. Innocent III. prescribes white, red, black (violet), and green (saffron). Later rules.*

The beginnings of association of colour with religious and social feeling go very far back into the history of civilisation in the western world. Light and day, night and darkness, are naturally connected with the contrasted feelings of joy and sadness, especially in a northern climate; and so their respective colours, white and black or dark, have been usually accepted by the Mediterranean nations as symbolical of the same feelings. This was especially the case in the Christian world with white, where the use of linen (adopted from Egypt and Syria) also naturally allied itself with the thoughts of a new and pure life, a life according to the best nature of man. It is not strange, therefore, that some writers of the third century, like Tertullian and Clement of Alexandria, should exhibit a repulsion to colours produced by dyeing, as unnatural and unspiritual (see passages in Marriott, pp. 184-6). The earliest rules that we possess dealing with the subject, in the Egyptian Church at any rate, prescribe white³¹ (as opposed to colours) as the dress of the clergy. St. Jerome's reference to a "tunica mundior" and a "candida vestis," used in processions, do not specify any particular season of the year, and may perhaps also imply that white was then the usual colour of the Roman as of the Alexandrian Church (*adv. Pelag.* i. 29, above n. 2). St. Chrysostom is also a contemporary witness for the use of a tunic of brilliant white by the clergy, we may suppose both at Antioch and Constantinople (*Hom.* 82, 6 in *S. Matt.*). He also complains elsewhere of the deacons' neglect to wear it. We

³⁰ Braun's section *die liturgischen Farben*, pp. 728-760 is more complete than any other known to us. Next to it, and not superseded by it, is Dr J. Wickham Legg's paper, *Notes on the history of the liturgical colours*, in *Tr. S. Paul's Eccl. Soc.* 1882, i. pp. 95-132, which laid the foundation of a proper historical treatment of the subject. Mr. W. H. St. John Hope's paper, *On the English liturgical colours* (1889), *ib.* ii. pp. 233-272, is a valuable appendix to Dr. Legg's essay. Mr. C. C. Rolfe's *The ancient use of liturgical colours*, Lond. 1879, is intended to prove that the levitical colours—gold, blue, purple, scarlet, and white—are the only colours rightly to be used in the Christian Church; but it is based on imperfect information. Mr. Marriott's Appendix A., *Associations of colour in primitive times, particularly in the first four centuries*, may be read with interest.

³¹ See the *Canons of Hippolytus* (as translated by Riedel, above n. 2, and the *Canons of Athanasius*, No. 28, and the *Canons of Basil*, No. 96. The first and last may be found in *Die Kirchen-rechts quellen des Patriarchats Alexandrien*, Leipzig, 1900, the second in a separate edition (*Text and Translation Society*, Williams and Norgate, 1904). Both the *Canons of Athanasius* and *Basil* seem to be later than 431; and probably after 451,

may at any rate safely conclude that white has generally been considered fitting for the great and joyous solemnity of Easter. It was natural for Christians to remember the white robes of our Lord at the Transfiguration, of the angels at the Tomb and on Olivet, and of the redeemed in the visions of the Apocalypse. White robes, we also know, were worn by the newly-baptized at the Easter services (Cyril Hierosol. *Cat.* xxii. 8). We find mention of this custom for clergy in early Gallican writers in the sixth century, such as Germanus of Paris and Gregory of Tours.³² It has been the general rule in the Western Church up to the present day, though some strange exceptions to it are known in our own country and elsewhere.³³

The only early reference to the use of black in church that is known to us is the statement that Acacius, Patriarch of Constantinople, in 476 clothed himself and his throne and the altar (sanctuary) in black as a protest against the condemnation of the Council of Chalcedon by the Emperor Basiliscus (Theodorus Lector *exc. H. E.* i. 32). As regards the use of colours in general at the Liturgy and at other services there seems to the present day to be no regular rule in the Eastern Church. We learn from the Greek Archimandrite in London (Very Rev. K. Pagonis) that the usual colour of the sticharion or under-vestment is white, but that it is often adorned with red lines or stripes, and that some clergy wear sticharia of this colour in Lent in memory of the Lord's passion. As regards the super-vestments (whether phelonion or sakkos) gold embroidery and variegated colours have been employed in place of vestments of a single colour since the fourteenth century. Churches which have large treasures or wardrobes are, it seems, making local rules for themselves, according to their means, as at the Patriarchal Churches of Constantinople and Jerusalem, and many of the monasteries of Athos, but this is not done in obedience to any canonical rule or established general custom. From another learned correspondent (Dr. John Gennadius) we learn that the colour of the sakkos of Patriarchs and Bishops is always purple—in imitation of the imperial dress—and that there is a general feeling in the Churches that white (or rather silver-

³² St. Germanus, *ep.* 2: "Praecinctio autem vestimenti candidi, quod sacerdos baptizaturus praecingitur, in signa Sancti Joannis agitur, qui praecinctus baptizavit Dominum. Albis autem vestibus in pascha induitur, secundum quod angelus ad monumentum albis vestibus cerneretur. Albae enim vestis exultationem significant." Gregory of Tours, *Vitae patrum*, c. 8, 5 (*P. L.* 71, 1045), speaks of "casulae candidae, quae per paschalia festa humeris sacerdotum imponuntur."

³³ For Easter Day and its octave the kalendar of Wells and the Liber consuetudinariorum of Westminster give red, and the Missal of Soissons, 1745, green (Braun, l.c. p. 744). Wells and Westminster also give red for Eastertide generally, and Soissons, Cologne, Milan, and Rheims, green. Green may have seemed a natural colour for spring, and red would be the colour of triumph.

cloth) is suitable for Easter, and black velvet for use during the Holy-week services and for funerals and requiems. We may therefore regard the orthodox Eastern Church as using a variety of colours, especially for its super-vestments, but as having only the beginnings of local rules for their use, very much as was the case in the West up to the twelfth century.³⁴

The Carolingian revival saw a certain amount of attention paid to colour in the Western Church, but it scarcely went further than the prescription of black or dark robes for times of penitence and supplication. Thus we find about the year 800 "vestes nigrae" ordered for the Candlemas Day (2nd Feb.) procession, and "planetæ fuscae" for Good Friday and days when the "Letania maior" is said.³⁵

Dr. Legg has collected early instances of various coloured vestments from monuments, particularly mosaics and mural paintings, including the figures of St. Vitalis and St. Apollinaris at Ravenna, who are dressed in warm olive green chasubles on mosaics of the first half of the sixth century (*S. Paul Ec. S. i.* 97). But nothing like a rule for colours, besides that which has been above indicated as to white and black or dark, can be discovered before the early part of the twelfth century. Beginnings of fuller rules of this date have been found at Milan (Beroldus), Besançon and Laon (Braun, p. 733), in which red, purple, and saffron are respectively mentioned, all for Good Friday. There is also the sequence of the Crusaders' Church at Jerusalem (printed by Dr. Legg in the *Reliquary* for October, 1887), in which black is ordered for all feasts of the B. V. M., Lent, and Advent; blue for Epiphany, Ascension, and Michaelmas; probably red for Passiontide, and white for Easter. But it is to the end of the century, and to the governing spirit of Innocent III., that the local Roman Church owes the precise statement of the rule which has now become general through the decay of other local usages in the West. The last (65th) chapter of the first book of his valuable treatise *Of the Mysteries of the Evangelic Law*, generally quoted as *De sacro altaris mysterio*, may be summarised here. Unfortunately there are no data for fixing the exact time or circumstances of its composition, but it seems to have been written before his elevation to the papacy (1198).

He begins by saying that there are four principal colours used for vestments in the Roman Church: white, red (rubeus), black, and green, just as there were four colours under the law "byssus et purpura, hyacinthus et coccus."

³⁴ The statements of Western books, such as Goar (*Euchol.* p. 113, ed. 1647), and Braun, l.c. p. 753, must therefore be rejected as much too precise.

³⁵ *Ordo of St. Amand*, ap. Duchesne, *Origines*, pp. 468, 474, 478, and Ps. Aleuin, *de dir. off.* cc. 7 and 18 (*P. L.* 101, pp. 1181, 1208), Braun, l.c. p. 732.

The church (says Innocent) wears *white* vestments on the festivals of confessors (*i.e.* all male saints not martyrs) and virgins, *red* on the solemnities of apostles and martyrs. Hence the beloved is called in the Canticles (v. 10): “candidus et rubicundus.” White is also used on the solemnities of angels, on the nativities of our Saviour and his forerunner, because of the purity of their births; on Epiphany, on account of the brightness of the star; at the “Hypopanti,” on account of the purity of Mary; on Maundy Thursday (in coena Domini) because of the chrism which is for the cleansing of the soul; on the day of Resurrection because of the white-robed angel; on that of the Ascension because of the white cloud into which Christ ascended. At the consecration of a bishop, the consecrators, &c., use the colour of the day, the consecrated always uses white. At the dedication of a church the consecrator always wears white. For the mass of the church (not of the day) is said at a dedication, and the church is called a virgin.

Red (he says) is the colour of apostles and martyrs because of their blood. It may be used on the Feast of the Cross, but it is better to use white, because it is a festival of its exaltation or invention, not of the passion. Red is used at Pentecost because of the fervour of the Spirit who appeared to the Apostles in the likeness of fiery tongues. On St. Peter and St. Paul’s martyrdom (29 June) red is used, but white on the conversion of St. Paul (24 Jan.), and the cathedra Petri (22 Feb.). So also on the decollation of the Baptist (29 Aug.) red is worn. On festivals of a virgin who is also a martyr, the colour of martyrdom has the precedence. But on All Saints’ Day (1 Nov.), when some use red, the Roman Court (Curia Romana) uses white, remembering *Rev.* vii. 9.

Black (he says) is to be worn on days of affliction and abstinence, for sins and for the departed; and so from Advent to Christmas Eve, and from Septuagesima to Easter Eve. “There is a dispute about the colours for Innocents’ Day: some use black, some red. We now use violet, as on *Laetare* (Mid-Lent) Sunday.”

Green (he says) remains for ferial and common days, because green is something between white and black and red. This colour is referred to in *Canticles* iv. 13, 14: “Cypri cum nardo, nardus et crocus.” Clearly Innocent identifies green and saffron colour.

To these four colours the rest are referred. Scarlet (*coccineus*) to red; violet to black; saffron to green. “*Quamvis nonnulli rosas ad martyres, crocum ad confessores, lilium ad virgines referant.*”

So far this great Roman writer.

The Roman use, thus expounded (not invented) by Innocent III., was adopted in this country in the important churches of Canterbury, York, London, and Exeter, and it has much to recom-

mend it, as distinguishing the seasons and festivals more fully than the Sarum use. The latter, though its earliest form is imperfectly known, is generally thought to have made no use of green, and only used saffron for "confessors." It alternated almost entirely between red and white, perhaps using an "ash-colour" for Lent, and black for requiems. The rules that have come down to us may be found in Rev. W. H. Frere's *Use of Sarum*, vol. i., pp. 26, 27, 63, and Index, p. 285. Mr. Frere notes that "one copy of the customary has provisions peculiar to itself; the vestments are classified less by their colour than by their magnificence as far as ordinary festivals are concerned; but for some there is a special appropriateness in white or red; black is ordered for masses of the dead (cp. 102, but contrast 212); stripes for the two great vigils of Easter and Whitsun; and stars for Epiphany; apparently green was begun on Wednesday after Trinity. The latter provisions are partly contrary and partly supplementary to the usual Sarum rules: they seem to be anterior to [the institution of] the festival of Corpus Christi, and therefore to belong at latest to the first half of the thirteenth century" (l.c., p. 285). The passage referred to is on p. 26 from a MS. called C of the fourteenth century at C. C. College, Oxford, No. 44. But it only specifies a partial use of green, i.e. for dalmatics and tunics of deacons and sub-deacons. As regards other uses the two tables attached to the valuable papers of Dr. Legg and Mr. Hope referred to in note 31 give much information at a glance as to our own churches, and the first table includes a number of Continental usages.

It is clear that there is no importance to be attached to liturgical colours from a dogmatic point of view. The symbolism involved is arbitrary and fanciful, except on the very broad principles which first prevailed that white is a symbol of joy, purity, and newness of life, and black or purple of sorrow and penitence, while red is almost universally accepted as proper to festivals of martyrs.

§ 10. *The benediction of vestments. No trace of it before the ninth century. Simplicity of the prayers in the Roman Rituale which are as old as the tenth or eleventh century. The forms in the Pontifical and the Missal are simple but inconsistent.*

There is no trace of any form of prayers for the benediction of vestments for sacred use before the ninth century. Certain of the prayers in use about that time have come down to us. The three at present in use in the *Rituale Romanum* can be traced up to the tenth or eleventh century, and have no connexion with any specially Roman doctrine. The first; "Omnipotens sempiterne Deus qui per Moysen famulum tuum," begins by referring to the

old command to Moses to make vestments for High Priests, Priests, and Levites, and prays that God would purify, bless, and consecrate these garments "ut divinis cultibus et sacris mysteriis apta et benedicta existant: his quoque sacris vestibus Pontifices et Sacerdotes seu Levitae tui induti, ab omnibus impulsionebus seu tentationibus malignorum spirituum muniti et defensi esse mereantur; tuisque mysteriis apte et condigne servire et inhaerere, atque in his tibi placite et devote perseverare tribue." This appears in the Egbert (p. 16) and Dunstan Pontificals (probably tenth or eleventh century), and elsewhere. The second: "Deus invictae virtutis triumphator" is found in the Leofric Sacramentary (p. 215), and in a more diffuse form in Egbert, and elsewhere, and was at first specially used for stoles or chasubles (stolas vel planetas) and is of an even simpler kind. The third: "Domine Deus omnipotens qui vestimenta Pontificibus, Sacerdotibus et Levitis in usum tabernaculi foederis necessaria Moysen famulum tuum agere iussisti," &c., is very like the first in substance and prays: "haec vestimenta in usum et cultum mysterii tui benedicere sanctificare et consecrare digneris; atque ministros altaris tui, qui ea induerint, septiformis Spiritus gratia dignanter repleti, atque castitatis stola, beata facias, cum bonorum fructu operum, ministerii congruentis immortalitate vestiri." This prayer is not found in our old English Pontificals, but in a Barberini Pontifical (eleventh and twelfth century), &c. (Braun, p. 763).

The formulae of conferring the vestments at the ordination of a presbyter in the modern pontifical are even simpler. The stole is given as the yoke of the Lord, "for His yoke is easy and His burden is light." The chasuble is given with the words "Accipe vestem sacerdotalem, per quam charitas intelligitur," &c.³⁶ In the *Praeparatio ad Missam*, however, the amice is treated as a helmet; the alb as a sign of purification and of being made white in the blood of the Lamb; the girdle of continence and chastity; the maniple is referred to weeping and sorrow, evidently from its use in wiping away tears; the stole is called "stola immortalitatis," lost in our first parents' transgression; the chasuble is the Lords' yoke "easy and light." Thus the official interpretations of stole and chasuble in the pontifical and missal, though really colourless as regards doctrine, are quite inconsistent with one another.

³⁶ The phrase "vestis sacerdotalis" goes back to comparatively early times; e.g. it is found in the Pontifical of Egbert, that is, before the medieval doctrine of the Eucharist was formulated.

§ 11. *Summary. Tendency of this chapter to dispel prejudices. On what grounds the use of vestments may be defended. Objections considered. Self-restraint needed. The matter discussed requires settlement.*

We have in the foregoing sections of this chapter attempted a concise, but exact, comprehensive and impartial survey of the origin and development of liturgical costume, and of the symbolism attached to it in the medieval Church. Such a survey will, in our judgment, be useful in dispelling preconceived ideas and prejudices, and will be of assistance in moderating the heat of controversy. Those who attack the use of liturgical vestments, as well as those who defend them, may be reminded that these vestments have no connection with Levitical dress, that they were simply the garments of civil life, ornamented and beautified, that their shape is strange simply because the fashion of dress has altered, and that the symbolism attached to them is arbitrary and fanciful, but at the same time quite innocent and uncontroversial. They may be also informed that the distinctions of colour in apparel, whether of the Church or its ministers, are, except in a rudimentary degree, modern and arbitrary, but nevertheless that as far as white and black (or violet) and red go they are based upon good sense and a natural association of ideas with the principal seasons and festivals which the Church observes. The use of green, as a neutral colour, seems also not unreasonable for ordinary days.

These observations may specially be applied to the chasuble, which is a garment of civil life still in use in Spain and Spanish-America, which even in the Roman Church of to-day is not confined to priests, and which in its form of development has followed lines of economy and convenience not of symbolism.

If vestments are to be "retained and be in use" it must be upon the ground that, whilst they are in no sense essential to the validity or even subservient to the doctrine of the sacraments, they are valuable as exhibiting our continuity with the past life of the Church, and with the whole stream of tradition as to external ornaments, which has been accepted in its chief forms in the east as well as in the west, and retained by the three Lutheran Churches of Scandinavia, as well as (in a certain degree) by our own. Vestments are thus visible symbols of the antiquity and the unity of the Church. What is, however, felt as an objection by the opponents of vestments is mainly to be summed up in two sentences: (1) that they are so closely associated with the Roman mass that they naturally draw men's minds to its doctrines, and (2) that they mar the simplicity of divine worship, and still further separate the clergy from the laity.

These objections are both worthy of consideration. The answer to them seems to be that feeling of this kind is entirely a matter of habit, and that if all English clergy wore the chasuble, there would be no feeling about any special type of doctrine attached to it. We know from history that there has been just such a change in public opinion in regard to the general use of the surplice (to which the Puritans violently objected), and we have experienced it as to the use of the surplice in the pulpit in our own memory, and to some extent as regards the eastward position of the celebrant at the holy table. The second objection surely can be met by self-restraint on the part both of clergy and of congregations. It is, we believe, right that there should be a distinctive dress for the clergy in their public ministrations, and it is not unreasonable that their dress in the ministration of the Sacraments should differ somewhat from their dress in reading the Common Prayers. The use of the surplice by our choirmen and boys, which has become common in parish churches, suggests the desirability of some distinction in the vesture of the clergy. But the growth of anything like luxury or excess in costliness should be restrained, and a healthy taste for simple forms and colours propagated. It is time that this question should be reduced to its due proportions, and that the Church, through its own constitutional assemblies, should take in hand the regulation, both as to its nature and extent, of any compromise which the welfare of the Church may seem to require.

We now pass to a consideration of what the existing letter of the law commands or permits the ornaments of the Church and the minister to be in the Church of England.

CHAPTER II.

THE ORNAMENTS RUBRIC OF THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER.

Pp. 46-90.

§ 1. HISTORY OF THE RUBRIC. *Origin in Act of Uniformity, 1 Elizabeth. Change in 1662. Suggestions in 1689 and 1879.* Pp. 48-50.

§ 2. INTERPRETATION OF THE TERMS OF THE RUBRIC. Pp. 50-6.

I. "Ornaments" defined as articles prescribed for use in the service and ministrations of the Church. Distinguished from "decorations."

II. "By the authority of Parliament in the second year of the reign of King Edward VI." This refers to the Prayer Book of 1549, not to any earlier usage, such as "the Order of Communion" (1548) or the canon law of the Church. Parallel methods of citation. Catena of authorities. Objections (Sandys' letter, &c.) answered.

§ 3. THE ORNAMENTS OF THE CHURCH. Pp. 56-64.

1. Ornaments actually mentioned or implied. (a) Those actually mentioned in 1549; (b) those implied in 1549; (c) those mentioned in 1662; (d) those required by the Canons of 1604. Questions as to the chrisom, cruets, vessels for oil or chrism, pyx.

2. Those that are subsidiary. Questions as to the pax, censer, bason, sacring bell, processional cross.

§ 4. THE ORNAMENTS OF THE MINISTER. Pp. 64-90.

I. From 1549 to 1566. Rubrics of 1549, 1552, 1559. Meaning of "retained and be in use." Mr. Tomlinson's theory rejected. The Rubrics, however, were not fully obeyed, nor were attempts made to enforce them as a whole: (1) Evidence from formal documents—A. Injunctions of 1559; B. Resolutions or Interpretations 1561; (2) Evidence as to practice; chasuble not worn; copes sometimes destroyed; surplice disused. Instances of the retention and use of copes and of neglect of surplice. Pp. 64-71.

II. The Advertisements of 1566. Chronological sketch of their history before publication, from 25 January, 1565, to 28 March, 1566. Printed by Wolfe: his relation to the Archbishop. Advertisements relating to ornaments of the Minister. Pp. 71-4.

What is the authority and intention of the Advertisements?

A. Theory that they are a taking of "other order" under Act of Uniformity, 1559. Evidence on this side. Pp. 74-7.

B. Theory that they are administrative orders issued by the Bishops on their own authority. Evidence on this side. (1) Disorders to be

suppressed general; (2) no reference to the proviso of the Act; (3) Parker's own language: no trace of publication in York; (4) Humphrey, "*The articles of the Archbishop*," &c.; (5) Subsequent references show that they had less authority than the *Injunctions*; (6) Grindal asserts that the law was not altered (1571); (7) different forms in which "other order" was taken for (a) wafer bread, (b) new table of lessons. Pp. 78-83.

C. Even if they involve "other order" they are not necessarily prohibitive. They may require a minimum, not impose a maximum. Pp. 83-4.

III. *The Canons of 1604.* Canons 24, 25, 58. How far were they obeyed? Pp. 84-7.

IV. *Revision of the Prayer Book in 1661-2.* Considerations from history of Savoy Conference, Wren's and Cosin's notes. New Rubric uses language of 1 Elizabeth, but omits the proviso. Judgment in *Ridsdale v. Clifton*. Reads *Advertisements into the Rubric*. Objections to this view. No attempt, however, was made after 1662 to enforce anything beyond the surplice. Conclusion. The Ornaments Rubric cannot rightly be interpreted as excluding the use of all vestments other than the surplice, with the addition of hood and cope in Cathedral Churches. Question of a Bishop's vesture untouched by the *Ridsdale* judgment. Pp. 87-90.

SECTION I.—THE HISTORY OF THE RUBRIC.

*Origin in Act of Uniformity, 1 Elizabeth. Change in 1662.
Suggestions in 1689 and 1879.*

The origin of the Rubric is to be sought in Elizabeth's Act of Uniformity 1559. The opening section of this required the use of the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI. "with one alteration or addition of certain lessons to be used on every Sunday in the year, and the form of the Litany altered and corrected, and two sentences only added in the delivery of the Sacrament to the Communicants, and none other or otherwise," but towards the close of the same Act is the following section: "Provided always, and be it enacted, that such ornaments of the Church and of the Ministers thereof shall be retained and be in use, as was in the Church of England by authority of Parliament in the second year of the reign of King Edward VI., until other order shall be therein taken by the authority of the Queen's Majesty, with the advice of the Commissioners appointed and authorised, under the Great Seal of England, for causes ecclesiastical, or of the Metropolitan." 1 Elizabeth, cap. 2. Gee and Hardy, pp. 459, 466.

In the Prayer Book published in the same year (1559) the following Rubric was prefixed to the order of Morning Prayer:

"And here it is to be noted that the Minister at the time of the Communion, and at all other times in his ministration, shall use such ornaments in the Church as were in use by the authority of Parliament in the second year of the reign of King Edward VI., according to the Act of Parliament set in the beginning of this book."

1604. No change was made in this Rubric in 1604.¹

[1637. In the Book of Common Prayer prepared for Scotland in 1637 the Rubric was made to run as follows:

"And here it is to be noted that the Presbyter or Minister at the time of the Communion, and at other times in his ministration, shall use such ornaments in the Church as are prescribed, or shall be by His Majesty or his successors, according to the Act of Parliament provided in that behalf."²]

1662. In 1662 the Rubric was brought into its present form.

(a) In Bishop Wren's notes on the Elizabethan Rubric we find the following: "But what is now fit to be ordered herein, and to preserve those that are still in use, it would be set down in express words, without these uncertainties which

¹ In later books the Rubric was incorrectly printed "according to the Act of Parliament set forth in the beginning of this book."

² *i.e.* Act 3 of the Parliament of Scotland, 1633. See below Chap. III., § 2 on the Episcopal habit, p. 94.

breed nothing but debate and scorn. The very words too of that Act, 2 Edward VI., for the Minister's ornaments, would be set down, or to pray to have a new one made; for there is somewhat in that Act that now may not be used." Jacobson, *Fragmentary Illustrations*, p. 55.

- (b) In Cosin's "corrected copy" (the "Durham Book") the greater part of the Elizabethan Rubric is erased, and there is written in the margin by Cosin himself: "Such ornaments of the Church and of the Ministers thereof at all times of their ministration shall be retained and be in use as were in this Church of England by the authority of Parliament in the second year of the reign of King Edward VI. That is to say . . . a surplice, &c. These are the words of the Act itself." The last words, "a surplice, &c.," have been written in with darker ink than the rest, apparently at a different time. See Parker, *Introduction*, p. cxxix.
- (c) In Sancroft's fair copy (1661) the Elizabethan Rubric is erased, and in its place is inserted the Rubric as it now stands: "And here it is to be noted, that such ornaments of the Church and of the Ministers thereof at all times of their ministration shall be retained and be in use, as were in the Church of England by the authority of Parliament in the second year of the reign of King Edward VI.," and in the margin is added the note, "These are the words of the Act itself, penult. ut supra."
- (d) In the Convocation book and the book annexed to the Act of Uniformity the Rubric stands as above, without the marginal note, nor has it ever been changed since.

1689. At the attempted revision of the Prayer Book in 1689 the following was proposed, but not agreed to, being left for further consideration: "Whereas the surplice is appointed to be used by all Ministers in performing Divine Offices, it is hereby declared, That it is continued only as being an ancient and decent habit. But yet if any minister shall come and declare to his Bishop that he cannot satisfy his conscience in the use of the surplice in Divine Service, in that case the Bishop shall dispense with his not using it, and if he shall see cause for it, he shall appoint a Curate to officiate in a surplice." Also the following note is written in the margin, "Mem. A Canon to specify the vestments."

1879. The Recommendation of the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury in 1879 was that the following should be added to the Rubric: "until further order be taken by lawful authority. In saying Public Prayers and ministering the Sacraments and

other rites of the Church, every Priest and Deacon shall wear a surplice with a stole or scarf, and the hood of his degree; and in preaching he shall wear a surplice with a stole or scarf, and the hood of his degree, or, if he think fit a gown with hood and scarf; and no other ornament shall at any time of his ministrations be used by him contrary to the monition of the Bishop of the diocese. Provided always that this Rubric shall not be understood to repeal the 24th, 25th, and 58th of the Canons of 1604."

The Convocation of York did not agree to this addition, and proposed to keep the Rubric of the sealed Books unaltered.

The Rubric is altogether omitted in the American Prayer Book (1790 and subsequent editions), as well as in the Irish Book.

SECTION II.—INTERPRETATION OF THE TERMS OF THE RUBRIC.

- I. "*Ornaments*"; II. "*by the authority of Parliament in the 2nd year of the reign of King Edward VI.*"

I. *Ornaments.*

The word "*ornaments*" is here used in its proper sense of *apparatus* or *equipment*, and thus refers not to mere decorations, but to the articles and dresses actually used in the course of the service. This is its regular technical sense in medieval writers. See Durandus, *Rat. Lib. i. c. 3*, "*De picturis et cortinis et ornamentis ecclesiae*," and *Lib. iii.*, "*De indumentis seu ornamentis ecclesiae, sacerdotum atque pontificum, et aliorum ministrorum*," and Lyndwood, *Provinciale*, *lib. i. tit 10*, "*Habeant Archidiaconi in scriptis redacta omnia ornamenta et utensilia ecclesiarum*."

That this is the use of the term in the Rubric was laid down by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the Judgment *Liddell v. Westerton*, where a careful distinction is drawn between "*ornaments*" and decorations or embellishments, and it is laid down that "*the word ornaments applies, and in this Rubric is confined, to those articles the use of which, in the service and ministrations of the Church, is prescribed by the Prayer Book of Edward VI.*" (Moore's *Special Report*, p. 156, Brooke, *Six Privy Council Judgments*, p. 51.)

It is further said in the same judgment that the word "*ornaments*" in the Rubric, is "*confined to such things as in the performance of the services the Minister was to use. . . . The Rubric to the Prayer Book of January 1, 1604, adopts the language of the Rubric of Elizabeth. The Rubric to the present Prayer Book adopts the language of the Statute of Elizabeth, but they all obviously mean the same thing, that the same dresses and the same utensils or articles which were used under the First*

Prayer Book of Edward VI. may still be used. None of them therefore can have any reference to articles not used in the services, but set up in churches as ornaments, in the sense of decorations. . . . Their Lordships therefore are of opinion that although the Rubric excluded all use of crosses in the services, the general question of crosses not used in the services, but employed only as decorations of churches, is entirely unaffected by the Rubric." (Brooke, pp. 53, 55.)

If the distinction is strictly to be observed, candles standing upon the altar or gradin, whether lighted or unlighted, would not be "ornaments," any more than altar crosses or vases; but if the lighting were to take place during the time of service, or if they were carried about, being thus actually used in the service, they would become "ornaments," and the question of their legality would come into consideration under this Rubric.

II. *By the authority of Parliament in the second year of the reign of King Edward VI.*

Edward VI. came to the throne on January 28, 1547. His "second year" therefore lasted from January 28, 1548, to January 27, 1549.

The First Prayer Book passed Parliament on January 21, 1549, just within the second year, but did not apparently receive the Royal assent till later, probably March, though the actual date does not seem to be certainly known. Anyhow, the book was not to come into *compulsory* use until Whitsunday, June 9, 1549, or if the book were procured at an earlier date three weeks after it should have been obtained. The earliest edition bears the date "the viiith daye of March in the 3rd year of the reign, &c."; and Wriothesley's *Chronicle* says that "Paul's quire with divers parishes in London and other places in England began the use of the said book in the beginning of Lent." *Chronicle*, vol. ii. p. 9.

It is argued by some persons that the reference in the Rubric must be to the state of things existing previously to the use of the First Prayer Book, and not to the first Act of Uniformity with the Prayer Book attached to it. This view was placed by Counsel before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in *Liddell v. Westerton* in 1857, and was deliberately rejected by the Court. It has, however, been recently revived and presented as a new "discovery."

In favour of this view there is—

- (a) A literal construction of the words "shall be retained and be in use as were in this Church of England [by the authority of Parliament] in the second year, &c."
- (b) A letter of Bishop Sandys to Archbishop Parker, dated

April 30, 1559, in which he says: "The last book of service is gone through with a proviso to retain the ornaments which were used in the first and second years of King Edward, until it please the Queen to take other order for them. Our gloss upon this text is that we shall not be forced to use them, but that others in the meantime shall not convey them away, but that they may remain for the Queen." Parker's *Correspondence*, p. 65.

The force of this statement is, however, somewhat weakened by the fact that the letter is not only a private and unofficial one, but is, as the writer himself says, written "hastily," and is therefore just such a letter as might easily contain a slip.

Further, if the words of the Rubric refer to the state of things existing before the passing of the Act of Uniformity and the publication of the First Prayer Book, what is the meaning of the words "by the authority of Parliament?"

It has been said—

(a) *That the reference is to the Order of the Communion of 1548.*

In order to establish this two theories have been propounded:

- i. That the Act of Henry VIII. giving to proclamations the force of law (31 Henry VIII., cap. 8) gave parliamentary authority to the Proclamation and the Order of Communion which accompanied it. But as a matter of fact Henry's Act was repealed in the Parliament of November-December, 1547, and the Proclamation with the Order of Communion was not issued till March, 1548.
- ii. That the Act of Parliament (1 Edward VI., c. 1) legalising Communion in both kinds gave authority of Parliament to the service afterwards provided. But it should be noticed that the Act while ordering Communion in both kinds makes no provision whatever for any special form of service. The Proclamation which accompanied the order of Communion, while it refers to the Act as establishing Communion in both kinds, only claims the authority of the King and Council for the service. "Our pleasure is, by the advice of our most dear uncle the Duke of Somerset, Governor of our person, and Protector of our Realms, Dominions, and Subjects, and other of our Privy Council, that the said Blessed Sacrament be ministered to our people, only after such form and manner as hereafter, by our authority, with the advice before mentioned is set forth and declared." See *Liturgies of Edward VI.* (P. S.), p. 1.³

³ The late Mr. Mickelthwaite in his Alcuin Club tract, *The Ornaments of the Rubric*, published in 1897, originally adopted i, but in the 3rd edition (1901)

(b) *That the reference is to such things as are required by the Canon Law of the Church, or so much of it was retained in force under the provisions of 25 Henry VIII., c. 19., which Act, though repealed by Mary, was re-enacted by Elizabeth.* The passage in the Act referred to, is the following: "Provided also such canons, constitutions, ordinances, and synodals provincial, being already made, which be not contrariant to the laws, statutes, and customs of this realm, nor to the damage and hurt of the King's royal prerogative, shall now be used and executed as they were before the making of this Act, till such term as they may be viewed, searched, or otherwise ordered and determined by the said two and thirty persons, or the more part of them, according to the form and effect of this present Act."

But to this contention it has been replied—

- i. That this Act does not give the "Authority of Parliament" to the Canon Law; it gives it no further authority than it had previous to the passing of the Act. If the Canon Law did not rest on a Parliamentary title before the Act was passed, neither did it afterwards. See Sir L. Dibdin in the *Report of the Royal Commission on Eccl. Disc.*, vol. ii. p. 132, and cf. *The Case against Incense*, p. 113.
- ii. That this view divorces "the authority of Parliament" in the Rubric from "the second year of King Edward VI.," and leaves unexplained the reference to the second year of Edward VI. instead of the 25th of Henry VIII.

On the other hand, in favour of the view that the reference in the Ornaments Rubric is to the Act of Uniformity and the Prayer Book of 1549, the following is urged.

- (a) Up to 1792 the following rule was in force: "Every Act of Parliament in which the commencement thereof is not directed to be from a specific time, doth commence from the first day of the Session of Parliament in which such Act is passed." (33 George III., c. 13).

Although a date was given in the Act by which the use of the Prayer Book was to be obligatory, yet there were other matters also in the Act (See Gee and Hardy, p. 355), and no date is given for the commencement of the Act itself. The old rule might therefore well be considered to apply to it.

- (b) An almost exact parallel to the language of the Ornaments Rubric, supposing it to refer to the Act of Uniformity, is

altered the passage and adopted ii, but admits that "perhaps it may be disputed whether technically it has the authority of Parliament." If, however, it, *i.e.* the Order of the Communion, had not this authority, the whole force of the tract is lost.

afforded by a Statute of Queen Mary (1 Queen Mary, Statute 3, cap. 10), where an Act of 2 and 3 Edward VI., which actually did not pass its third reading in the House of Lords till January 29 (*Journals of the House of Lords*, i. p. 336), and therefore can only have received the Royal Assent at some time in Edward's third year, is referred to as passed "by the authority of Parliament in the same second year." (See *The Case against Incense*, pp. 8, 53.) Similar examples are given by Mr. Chadwyck Healey, *Report of Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline*, vol. iii. pp. 1, 2, and Gee, *Elizabethan Prayer Book*, pp. 112, 113.

- (c) In the second Act of Uniformity (5 and 6 Edward VI. cap 1, sec. 5), the First Prayer Book is actually said to have been ordained "by the Act of Parliament made in the second year of the King's Majesty's reign. (Gee and Hardy, p. 371.)
- (d) Edward VI. wrote in his Journal under "year 2": "A Parliament was called, where a uniform order of prayer was institute before made by a number of bishops and learned men gathered together in Windsor;" then after a few more notices occur the words "3 year." Burnet, *Hist. Ref., Records*, book ii., from Cotton MS., Nero, c. 10.
- (e) In favour of the same view is the continuous historical interpretation of the words of the Rubric going back certainly to within a very few years of its insertion in the Elizabethan Prayer Book.

i. *Sharp* (1753). "The injunction concerning the habits and ornaments of Ministers which is at the end of Edward VI.'s first service book, with its explanation in the Act of Uniformity by Queen Elizabeth, is the legal or statutable rule of our church habits to this day." *On the Rubric*, p. 208.

ii. *Gibson* (1713) after quoting the words of the *First Prayer Book*, says that "legally the ornaments of Ministers in performing Divine Service are the same now as they were in 2 Edward VI." *Codex*, vol. i. pp. 362, 363.

iii. *Wheatley* (1710). "The habits enjoined by the first Prayer Book of King Edward and forbid by the second, were now restored" [*i.e.* in 1559] "We must here have recourse to the Act of Parliament here mentioned, viz.: in the second year of the reign of King Edward VI., which enacts so that by this Act we are again referred to the Common Prayer Book of King Edward VI. for the habits in which Ministers are to officiate." *On the Book of Common Prayer*, pp. 27, 29.

iv. *Nicholls* (1710) takes the same view, and quotes the final

Rubrics from the First Prayer Book. *Commentary on the Book of Common Prayer.*

v. Bingham (1706). *Works*, vol. viii. p. 112-114 (ed. 1834).⁴

vi. J. Johnson (1706). *The Clergyman's Vade Mecum*, p. 19.

vii. Wren (1660). "The very words too of that Act, 2 Edward VI., for the Minister's ornaments would be set down, or to pray to have a new one (*i.e.* Rubric) made, for there is somewhat in that Act which may not be used." W. Jacobson's *Fragmentary Illustrations*, p. 55.

viii. Cosin (1640-1660) "At the celebration of the Holy Communion it was ordained by the rules and orders of the first Liturgy set forth by the Church of England and confirmed by authority of Parliament in the second year of King Edward VI., that the priest, &c." "At all other times of his ministration, that is (as is set forth in the first Liturgy of King Edward), &c." Notes, Second Series, *Works*, vol. v. p. 230; *cf.* the Third Series *ib.*, p. 438, where Cosin says that the reference is "to the second year of that king, when his service book and injunctions were in force by authority of Parliament" . . . "and those ornaments of the Church, which by former laws not then abrogated, were in use, by virtue of the Statute 25, Henry VIII., and for them the Provincial Constitutions are to be consulted, such as have not been repealed, standing then in the second year of King Edward VI., and being still in force by virtue of this Rubric and Act of Parliament."

ix. The Puritan Tract *The Abridgement* (1605): "What Bishop is there that in celebrating the Communion, and exercising every other public ministration doth wear, besides his rochet, a surplice or alb, and a cope or vestment, and doth hold his pastoral staff in his hand or else hath it borne by his Chaplain? to all which, notwithstanding, he is bound by the First Book of Common Prayer made in King Edward VI. his time, and consequently by authority of the same Statute whereby we are compelled to use those ceremonies in question."

x. *Certain Considerations*, another Puritan tract of the same date (1605): "We set down the words of the Statute of the parish book and of the *Book of the Second of King Edward the Sixth.*, unto which Book of King Edward for the use of ornaments the Ministers be referred both by the parish book, and the Statute of 1 Elizabeth, chapter 2."

xi. Beale, the Puritan, in his *Controversy with Whitgift* in 1584, according to the summary of his book endorsed by Cecil, "goeth about to prove that divers ceremonies which were used in the

⁴ Bingham (*French Church's Apology*) and Johnson are only referred to here as taking the view that the Ornaments Rubric refers to the Prayer Book of 1549.

second and third year of King Edward the Sixth which be termed superstitious and absurd and not meet to be observed, are by law in force, and yet now omitted contrary to law." Whitgift apparently could only reply that he had never seen the book. See Strype's *Whitgift*, p. 144, and Appendix, numb. vi.⁵

xii. Another Puritan tract, *Certain Demands, &c.* (1566): "Because by the *Book of Common Prayer of the second of Edward VI.*, whereunto only (as we take it) touching ornaments, rites, and ceremonies, the book hath reference."

Still earlier the fact that the First Prayer Book was regarded as belonging to the second year of Edward's reign is shown by a paper addressed to Elizabeth in 1559, entitled *Certain reasons to be offered to the Queen's Majesty's consideration why it is not convenient that the Communion should be ministered at an altar*. In this the following words occur: "Dr. Ridley, late Bishop of London, procured taking down of altars in his diocese about the third year of the said king; and defendeth his doings by the first book set forth *Anno 2d Edward VI.*" Petyt MSS., 538. 38, fol. 30, Inner Temple Lib.

Against this there is nothing to be brought except the letter of Sandys quoted above, and the fact that the note in the "Considerations upon the Book of Common Prayer" drawn up by the Lords' Committee in 1641 is indeterminate, referring only to the date, not by name to the book or Act:—"Whether the Rubric should not be mended, where all vestments in time of divine service are now commanded which were used 2 Edward VI." *Cardwell's Conferences*, p. 274. For an inference drawn from this, see the evidence given in the *Report of the Royal Commission on Eccl. Disc.*, vol. ii. p. 174, where, however, it is admitted that there is only "a small point in it."

SECTION III.—THE ORNAMENTS OF THE CHURCH.

1. *Ornaments actually mentioned or implied*; 2. *Ornaments that are subsidiary.*

1. Ornaments actually mentioned or implied.

(a) The following "ornaments" and articles are actually mentioned by name in the First Prayer Book of Edward VI.

1. The Bible. Cf. Canon 80 of 1604.
2. Prayer Book.
3. Book of Homilies.

⁵ The language of the *Admonition to Parliament* (1572) also seems to imply that its authors regarded the Rubric as referring to the Prayer Book of 1549: "Now there is required an alb, a surplice, a vestment, a pastoral staff"; the second edition adding in the margin: "These are required by their Pontifical." See *Puritan Manifestoes* (ed. Freere and Douglas, 1907), p. 10.

4. Poor man's box. *Cf.* Canon 84, taken from Elizabeth's and Edward's Injunctions.
5. Corporas. *Cf.* Canon 82.
6. Paten.
7. Chalice or Communion Cup.
8. Font. *Cf.* Canon 81.
9. "White vesture" for the newly baptized, commonly called "the Chrisom."
10. Quire door.
11. Bell. *Cf.* Canons 15, 67, 88, 111.
12. Pulpit. *Cf.* Canon 83, practically repeating Elizabeth's and Edward's Injunctions.
13. Chair for the Bishop.

[Besides these there is mention of "the Lord's table," or "altar," or "God's board." This is not contained in the above enumeration, because it is said that the altar is not in itself an "Ornament of the Church," so Sir H. Jenner Fust, *Faulkner v. Litchfield*. "The altar is nowhere that I can find enumerated amongst the ornaments of the Church or choir." (1 Robertson's *Eccl. Reports*, 184, p. 254). It is, however, ordered in Canon 82 to be "covered, in time of divine service with a carpet of silk or other decent stuff, thought meet by the ordinary of the place, if any question be made of it."]

(b) The following are the "Ornaments" implied but not actually mentioned in the first Prayer Book.

1. Credence.
2. Cruets for wine and water.
3. Vessels for chrism and oil, for Baptism and Visitation of the Sick.
4. Pyx or vessel to carry the Eucharist to the sick when a sick person was to be communicated from the open communion celebrated in church on the same day.

To these may perhaps be added :

5. Lectern.
6. Litany Desk, "where they are accustomed to say the Litany." *Cf.* Canon 15. "Some convenient place, according to the discretion of the Bishop of the diocese, or ecclesiastical ordinary of the place." *Cf.*, however, Micklethwaite, *The Ornaments of the Rubric*, p. 50, from which it appears that there is no evidence of its use so early as the reign of Edward VI. Micklethwaite gives "for a form to serve in Procession time" from the Churchwardens' accounts of Cheswardine, Salop, in Mary's reign, as the earliest instance known to him. In the Inventory of Canterbury Cathedral, 1584, occurs "a low deske in the myddest of the Chore." See Wickham Legg and St. John Hope, *Inventories of Christ Church. Canterbury*, p. 242.

7. Reading desk. *Cf.* Canon 82, "likewise that a convenient seat be made for the Minister to read service in."

(c) Ornaments mentioned by name in the present Prayer Book.

In addition to 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13 in list (a) we have mention of the following:

1. Fair white linen cloth. *Cf.* (a) 5.
2. Decent basin (for the alms).
3. Flagon. *Cf.* Canon 20, where it is ordered that the wine be brought to the Communion Table "in a clean and sweet standing pot or stoop of pewter, if not of purer metal."
4. Fair linen cloth (distinct from 1).
5. Reading pew. *Cf.* (b) 7.

(d) In addition to these the Canons of 1604 require besides the "ornaments" for which reference to them has been already made—

1. A parchment book for the register of christenings, weddings, and burials.
2. A "sure coffer with three locks and keys" for the safe keeping of the said book. Canon 70.

Questions of importance arising from a consideration of these lists are the following:

1. Does the mention or suggestion of an "ornament" in the First Prayer Book of Edward VI. imply that the ceremony in which it was used is still permissible, even if all directions for it have been omitted from the Prayer Book?

Under this head must be considered (a) 9, and (b) 2, 3, 4.

- (a) 9. The Chrisom. The use of it is apparently recognised in the "Interpretations and further considerations of certain injunctions," prepared by the Bishops in 1561, where we find the following: "*Item*, to avoid contention, let the Curate have the value of the Chrisome, not under the value of 4d., and above as they can agree, and as the state of the parents may require." Cardwell, *Doc. Annals*, i. p. 238.

The use evidently lingered for some time. The accounts of St. Thomas's Church, Salisbury, show that Chrisom fees were regularly paid there up to 1592. See also the *Injunctions* of Middleton, Bishop of St. David's, 1583: "*Item*, that no minister or priest do put on or suffer others to put on the child's head that is baptized, the Chrisom (as it is superstitiously called) wherein hath been great superstition and yet is in sundry places." Further, Cosin says that "they generally observe that custom in the north parts of this kingdom" (3rd series of Notes, probably written before 1640), but he points out that it was "altered," and there-

fore apparently does not regard it as legal. *Works*, vol. v. p. 500. Cf. "Reasons showing the necessity of reformation, &c., by divers Ministers of sundry counties in England 1660," where "offering of Chrisomes at Churchings" are mentioned, quoted in *Hierurgia*, vol. ii. p. 252.

- (b) 2. The cruet for water. This, under the Lincoln judgment, may fairly come in as "subsidiary" under the question raised below.
 - (b) 3. No evidence of the use of the vessels for oil or chrism seems to be forthcoming beyond that afforded by such an entry as that in the Canterbury Inventory of 1563, "three pewter pots otherwise amples for oyle" (*Inventories of Christ Church, Canterbury*, p. 229), and such questions as those in Grindal's Articles of Visitation in the Province of York (1571): "Whether your parson . . . use any oil and chrism . . . in the ministration of the sacrament of Baptism," and the prohibition in his Injunctions of the same date, "nor shall use any oil or chrism, &c." Cf. his articles for Canterbury (1576), where he asks whether all chrismatories be destroyed. Cardwell, *Doc. Annals*, i. p. 399.
 - (b) 4. The pyx. There appears to be very little evidence for the retention of the pyx anywhere after Elizabeth's accession, though "a monstrant of latten to carrie the sacrament in uppon Festyvall Dayes" occurs in the Inventory of Canterbury in 1563. (*Inventories, &c.*, p. 229, and see *Hierurgia*, ii., p. 162.)
2. Ornaments that are not mentioned or implied. It has been decided in *Liddell v. Westerton* that some articles not expressly mentioned in the Rubric but subsidiary to the service are permissible. (See Moore's *Special Report*, p. 156, and Brooke's *Six Privy Council Judgments*, p. 74). Under this head, organs, hassocks, &c., are allowed. But how far does this principle carry us?

A claim has sometimes been made that some ornaments at least (together with the ceremonies with which they are connected) not expressly prohibited, may still be used, on the ground that omission is not necessarily prohibition, and that traditional usage is taken for granted in the Prayer Book of 1549.⁶ It is true that in some minor matters, as, *e.g.*, the termination of the Collects, some knowledge of traditional usage is presupposed, and that there are cases where the directions are obviously incomplete; but broadly it appears to be true that the publication of the Prayer Book in English involved, so to speak, a fresh start, and that the directions in it were intended to be so far complete

⁶ See *The Case for Incense*, p. 7 *seq.*

as to guide the priest to the words he was to say and the definite ritual acts he was to perform, and not to permit ceremonies (and together with ceremonies the "ornaments" used in connexion with them) to be employed unless expressly directed. The "rules called the Pie" (which dealt with the services of the Breviary) were abolished, and in their stead "certain rules" were set forth in the book, which are described in the Preface as not only "few in number," but also "plain and easy to be understood." Local and diocesan "uses" were swept away, and "all the whole realm" was to "have but one use." If doubts arose "in the use and practice" under the directions of the book, since "nothing can be so plainly set forth but doubts may arise," in order to "appease all such diversity" reference was to be made to the Bishop of the diocese, with a further reference to the Archbishop, if the Bishop of the diocese was in doubt. The general method of abolishing a ceremony and ornament previously used appears to have been by the omission of any reference to them in the prayers and rubrics of that book. Very few usages or ceremonies are expressly prohibited in so many words. A few are, viz., the use of the Invitatory, the practice of elevation, the use of bread in the Eucharist with a print on it⁷—but very few; whereas for a large number of those previously in use no direction is given, and the obvious intention of the compilers of the book is that these should not be continued. This appears clearly in the Baptismal Office, and the Benediction of the Font. In these services some of the ancient ceremonies were expressly ordered, *e.g.* the use of the Chrisom and of anointing; of others, as the giving of salt (in the order of making Catechumens), the placing of the lighted taper in the hand of the baptized or of the sponsors, the placing of wax and oil in the water, there is no mention whatever. It can scarcely be seriously urged that the use of these together with the words accompanying the ceremonial act was intended to be permitted, though not obligatory, for any such contention would land us in the difficulty that there would be a certain number of permissible ceremonies and ornaments, for the use of which the priest was left without any directions whatever. Traditional knowledge might fairly be regarded as sufficient to show him the *method* of performing some acts which he was told in general terms to do, but for the performance of such ceremonial acts as those referred to above something more would be needed. They could hardly be continued without some written authority.

⁷ "Then shall be said or sung *without any Invitatory* this Psalm."

"These words before rehearsed are to be said, turning still to the altar, *without any elevation, or showing the Sacrament to the people.*"

"For avoiding of all matters and occasions of dissension, it is meet that the bread prepared for the Communion be made, through all this realm, after one sort and fashion: that is to say, unleavened, and round, as it was afore, *but without all manner of print, &c.*"

Again, according to the contention referred to, there would be a special class of ceremonies, of which there could hardly fail to be some account given or notice taken in the section "Of ceremonies, why some be abolished and some retained"; which, however, throughout speaks only of two classes, those abolished and those retained, a classification which is apparently intended to be exhaustive, leaving no room for a third class, those permitted but not enjoined.

Moreover, the following facts must be borne in mind :—

- (1) The Preface of the Book of 1549 contained the following clause (only omitted in 1662): "Furthermore by this Order the Curates shall need none other books for their public service, but this book and the Bible, by the means whereof, the people shall not be at so great charge for books, as in time past they have been." This seems to disallow the use of any ornament accompanied by a form of words not found in the Prayer Book, since otherwise some other book besides the Bible and Prayer Book would be needed.

Although the Preface comes substantially from the Breviary of Cardinal Quignon, and much of its language and the illustrations brought forward in it refer to the Hour Services and the order of Mattins and Evensong, yet such a statement as that cited above, speaking of "this book," is perfectly general and must refer to the whole Book of Common Prayer in all its parts (not, however, including the Ordinal, which was not published till 1550).

- (2) By 3 and 4 Edward VI., cap. 10, the possession of any of the ancient service books was forbidden, the books themselves being ordered to be recalled, defaced, and destroyed. Clearly, then, the use of "ornaments" for the regulation of which any of these books was required was abolished.

It would seem to follow from these considerations, as well as from the words of the Acts of Uniformity, that those who compiled the Prayer Book did not contemplate the interpolation of additional ceremonies with appropriate "ornaments" beyond those for which provision is actually made in the book; and thus any "ornament" or article made use of must be honestly subsidiary to the service, and not used to introduce a new ceremony.

The bearing of the foregoing on the use of such ornaments as the pax, the censor, the bason for washing the priest's hands, the sacring bell, the processional cross, and other ornaments which were certainly in use up to 1549, and are not in so many words prohibited in the Rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer, is obvious.

- (a) The Pax. The use of this article (also known as the *Osculatorium*) is said to have been introduced in the place of the

old practice of mutual salutation about the thirteenth century (Maskell, *Ancient Liturgy*, p. 170, ed. 2). It was one of the "ornaments of the Church" to be provided by the parishioners (Lyndwood, *Provinc.*, iii., tit. 27). Clear directions for its use were given in the Sarum Missal (ed. Dickinson, 624), and so late as 1548 regulations with regard to it were issued by "the King's Majesty's Visitors" in their Injunctions for the Deanery of Doncaster (Cardwell, *Doc. Annals*, i. p. 68). No mention of it, however, is found in the English Prayer Book of 1549, and all directions for its use are omitted. Later on it is occasionally mentioned in Inventories among things still remaining (*Hierurgia*, i. 61, 154); but it was commonly regarded as a "monument of superstition," and ordered to be destroyed (e.g. in the Visitation Articles of Grindal for York, 1571, Aylmer, 1577, and Sandys, 1578. *Report of Ritual Commission*, p. 408, 414, 418, 423). If the argument given above be sound, it is no longer to be regarded as a legal "ornament."

- (b) The Censer. The fumigatory use of incense outside the service was by no means uncommon in the 17th century. There are, for instance, the well-known notices of it in Herbert's *Country Parson*, c. xiii., and Evelyn's *Diary* (Easter Day, 1684). It was thus used not only on great festivals to sweeten the Church, but also on other occasions, when the Church had been rendered insanitary, from funerals or other causes (see the examples in *The Case for Incense*, p. 159). With such use the Ornaments' Rubric has nothing whatever to do. With regard to the ceremonial use of the censer during the service, it may be noted that, according to the Sarum Missal, in which the directions are fuller than in some other books, as those of York and Hereford, incense was ordered at the Introit (*Miss. Sar.* 581, ed. Dickinson), at the Gospel (*ib.* 12), and at the Offertory (*ib.* 593), and on two out of these three occasions certain words were to be said in connexion with its use. There is no question here of the permissible character of private prayers on the part of the priest. The censuring, whether accompanied by a form of words or not, must be regarded as a ceremonial act, and not as a mere adjunct to the Introit, Gospel, or Offertory. No directions for the use of any form of words or for censuring are contained in the English Prayer Book, and tradition alone, after the old service books had been swept away, would have been quite insufficient for a guide, unless the use was obligatory and therefore universal, and thus for

the use of the censer at these points of the service reference would necessarily have to be made to the disused service books such as the Sarum Missal, which, as we have seen, were not needed by the curate, and were ordered to be destroyed. It would appear, therefore, that the censer is not a legal "ornament" of the Church. Further, censers are not seldom mentioned as "monuments of superstition" to be destroyed, in episcopal Injunctions and Articles. On the other hand it must be remembered that a censer was consecrated by Bishop Andrewes in Worcester Cathedral (*Minor Works*, p. 162), and was included in the furniture of his Chapel, and according to Prynne was used "at the reading of the First Lesson" (*Canterbury's Doom*, p. 122); there was also one in Cosin's chapel at Peterhouse (*ib.* p. 73), and there was some use of incense before the actual service began at the dedication of an altar at Wolverhampton in 1635, where "was incense burning which perfumed the whole Church," and the clergy are said to have come in, every one of them with "a paper in his hand, which they termed a censer, and so they went up to the altar, reading it as they went, for they looked often on it" (*A Quench Coal*, quoted in *The Case for Incense*, p. 163). There is also the solitary case of the Bodmin Inventory in 1566, where a censer is included among the goods and ornaments "to be used and occupied to the honour of God in the same Church." (See *The Case for Incense*, p. 157, and cf. *The Case against Incense*, p. 71.)

- (c) The Bason for the washing of the priest's hands. The use of this was ordered by the ancient service books, which contained words to be used by the priest at the time of the washing of the hands (*Miss. Sar.* 594). Since no directions for this were contained in the English Prayer Book of 1549 (or in any subsequent book), it is obvious that if it is used now recourse must be had to some other book than the Book of Common Prayer; consequently the considerations urged above would seem to show that it is not a legal ornament. There is, however, some evidence of a limited use of it being made in the seventeenth century, viz. by Bishop Andrewes in his chapel (*Minor Works*, p. 156; cf. *Canterbury's Doom*, p. 123), and at the consecration by him of Jesus Chapel, Southampton, 1620 (*Sparrow's Collection*, p. 395; Harington, *On Consecration of Churches*, p. 168, 1844), and at the consecration of an altar at Wolverhampton in 1635 (*A Quench Coal*, quoted *Hierurgia*, ii. 178).
- (d) The Sacring Bell. There are no directions for the use of

this in any of the English Prayer Books, and consequently, on the principles stated above, its use at the Sanctus or Consecration would seem to be excluded. Moreover "all ringing and knolling of bells" during the time of service had been forbidden by the Injunctions of 1547 "except one bell in convenient time to be rung or knolled before the sermon" (Cardwell, *Doc. Annals*, i. 15). The sacring bell was accordingly treated as a "monument of superstition" in Elizabeth's reign, and questions as to its destruction are sometimes found among Visitation Articles (*e.g.* Grindal's for York in 1571, Aylmer's 1577, and Sandys' 1578. See *Report of Ritual Commission*, pp. 408, 418, 423). A hand bell is, however, mentioned in the Bodmin Inventory of 1566 (see above); and the "ringing of hand bells in many places" is mentioned among the "points of Popery" remaining in the Church of England in a Puritan complaint in Elizabeth's reign (quoted *Hierurgia*, i. 259).

- (e) The Processional Cross. If this is simply carried at the head of the procession on entry into or departure from the Church, its use would seem to be neither more nor less illegal than the wands of churchwardens, or the verges carried before bishops, deans, and other dignitaries in Cathedral Churches.⁸

SECTION IV.—THE ORNAMENTS OF THE MINISTER.

I. *From 1549 to 1566*; II. *The Advertisements of 1566*; III. *The Canons of 1604*; IV. *The Revision of 1661-2*.

I. *From 1549 to 1566*.

The directions as to the ornaments of the Minister in the First Prayer Book of Edward VI., published in March, 1549, are found in three places:—

(1) The fourth Rubric before the Communion Service is as follows: "Upon the day and at the time appointed for the ministration of the Holy Communion, the Priest that shall execute the holy ministry shall put upon him the vesture appointed for that ministration, that is to say, a white alb plain with a vestment or cope. And where there be many Priests or Deacons, there so many shall

⁸ The ceremonial use of incense has been three times declared to be illegal by the Arches Court, viz. in *Martin v. Mackonochie*, 2 A. and E. 116, *Sumner v. Wix*, 3 A. and E. 58, and *Elphinstone v. Purchas*, 3 A. and E. 66. The use of the Sanctus bell at the time of the consecration of the Elements was declared illegal by the same Court in *Elphinstone v. Purchas*, 3 A. and E. 66. Neither of these matters has ever been before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

be ready to help the Priest in the ministration as shall be requisite, and shall have upon them likewise the vestures appointed for their ministry, that is to say, albs with tunicles." "Tunicle" here probably includes the deacon's dalmatic with which it was almost identical.

(2) The first Rubric after the Communion Service directs that on Wednesdays and Fridays "though there be none to communicate with the priest, yet these days (after the Litany ended) the priest shall put upon him a plain alb or surplice, with a cope, and say all things at the altar (appointed to be said at the celebration of the Lord's Supper), until after the Offertory."

(3) At the end of the book there are "certain notes for the more plain explication and decent ministration of things contained in this book," as follows:

"In the saying or singing of matins and evensong, baptising and burying, the Minister in parish churches or chapels annexed to the same shall use a surplice. And in all cathedral churches and colleges the Archdeacons, Deans, Provosts, Masters, Prebendaries and Fellows, being graduates, may use in the quire beside their surplices such hood as pertaineth to their several degrees which they have taken in any university within this realm. But in all other places every Minister shall be at liberty to use any surplice or no. It is also seemly that graduates, when they do preach, shall use such hoods as pertaineth to their several degrees. And whensoever the Bishop shall celebrate the Holy Communion in the Church, or execute any other public ministration, he shall have upon him, beside his rochet, a surplice or alb, and a cope or vestment, and also his pastoral staff in his hand, or else borne or holden by his Chaplain." (Cf. Wriothesley's *Chronicle*, vol. ii. p. 17, and *Greyfriars Chronicle*, in *Monumenta Franciscana*, vol. ii. p. 220, for the carrying out of these directions.)

It would appear from the *Greyfriars Chronicle* that the copes for the Litany at St. Paul's Cathedral were not disused till Christmas, 1550. "Item, at Christmas was put down in Paul's the *Rectores Chori* with all their copes at procession, and no more to be used." *Mon. Fr.* ii. 229.

In the Second Prayer Book (1552) the directions given above were all omitted, and in their place there stood the following, before "the Order where Morning and Evening Prayer shall be used and said":

"And here is to be noted, that the Minister at the time of the Communion, and at all other times in his ministrations, shall use neither alb, vestment, nor cope, but being Archbishop, or Bishop, he shall have and wear a rochet; and being a Priest or Deacon, he shall have and wear a surplice only." (Cf. Wriothesley's *Chronicle*, vol. ii. p. 78, and Stow's *Chronicle*, p. 608, for the carrying out of these directions.)

In 1559 for this was substituted the "Ornaments Rubric," as given above, p. 48, which was inserted, probably by the Privy Council, as a memorandum or an interpretation of the clause in the Act of Uniformity.

According to Mr. Tomlinson (*The Prayer Book, Articles and Homilies*, p. 122 seq., and *Report of Royal Commission on Eccl. Disc.* vol. i. p. 212) the Rubric was a "fraud Rubric," inserted without any authority and utterly perverting the meaning of the proviso in the Act of Uniformity. On this theory the words of the Act "shall be retained and be in use" did not mean that the ornaments were to be used, but rather that they were not to be used, the words being said to be equivalent to "held in use," i.e. kept for the Queen or Church, or, in other words, not to be made away with, but retained till further directions were given as to the purpose to which they were to be put.

But against this it may be urged:

- (a) The meaning sought to be attached to the words "be in use" is quite unnatural; and no true parallel or illustration is brought forward justifying it.
- (b) The Rubric, whatever its origin, is the only *expositio contemporanea* of the proviso in the Act, no indication, so far as we are aware, being given in any of the numerous references to the Rubric in the controversies of the time that the Rubric either perverted the meaning of the Act or was wanting in authority.
- (c) This view leaves entirely unexplained the specific reference to the second year of Edward VI.
- (d) It also leaves unexplained the habitual wearing of the cope in some places, and the occasional use of the alb.

For these reasons we adhere to the view that the Act and Rubric alike ordered a return to the use of the ornaments of the Church and Minister, of the First Prayer Book of Edward VI.

It is, however, quite clear that from the first the Rubric was never fully obeyed and that no attempt was made to enforce its requirements as a whole.

- (1) *This is shown by more or less formal documents making a claim to some sort of authority.*

A. *The Queen's Injunctions of 1559.*

Injunction XXX.: "Item. Her Majesty, being desirous to have the prelacy and clergy of this realm to be had as well in outward reverence as otherwise regarded for the worthiness of their ministries, and thinking it necessary to have them known to the people in all places and assemblies, both in the Church and without, and thereby to receive the honour and estimation due to the special

messengers and Ministers of Almighty God, willeth and commandeth, that all Archbishops and Bishops and all other that be called or admitted to preaching or ministry of the Sacraments, or that be admitted into vocation ecclesiastical, or into any society of learning in either of the Universities, or elsewhere, shall use and wear such seemly habits, garments and square caps, as were most commonly and orderly received in the latter year of the reign of King Edward VI., not thereby meaning to attribute any holiness or special worthiness to the said garment, but, as St. Paul writeth, 'Omnia decenter et secundum ordinem fiant.' Cardwell, *D. A.*, i. p. 225.

On this the question arises whether it refers to the dress of the Minister *in Church*, or only outside.

The general view (so Gee, p. 159) is that it refers only to the "habits" and out-of-door dress. In favour of this is the fact that there is no mention in this or in any other Injunction of the surplice by name. Moreover, in two out of the three copies of the *Resolutions* or *Interpretations* mentioned below (viz., those in the Petyt MSS.) there are figures in the margin giving the number of each several Injunction to which there appears to be a definite reference. The 8th Interpretation or Resolution directs that "All ministers and others having any living ecclesiastical shall go in apparel agreeable, or else within two monitions given by the Ordinary be deposed or sequestered from his fruits according to the direction of the said Ordinary or his lawful deputy." Against this is placed the number 30, showing that it is intended to be an Interpretation of the 30th Injunction; whereas against the 14th Resolution (quoted below), ordering the cope and surplice, no number whatever is placed. This is an important piece of evidence, not hitherto noticed, that the Injunction was understood only of out-of-door apparel. It must, however, be noticed that the Injunction *does* mention "in the Church" as well as "without;" and Parker, in his Visitation Articles of 1563, has the following: "Item, whether your priests, curates, or ministers do use in the time of the celebration of divine service to wear a surplice prescribed by the Queen's Majesty's Injunctions and the Book of Common Prayer." *Ritual Commission*, p. 403. So again in his Visitation Articles for Norwich in 1567, and for Canterbury in 1569. Similarly Cox, in his Visitation Articles for Ely, c. 1571. *Ritual Commission*, p. 406.

On the other hand the language of the latter part of the Injunction is quite general, and does not look as if it referred to a definite direction of the Prayer Book of 1552.

Injunction XLVII.: "Item, that the Churchwardens of every parish shall deliver unto our Visitors the inventories of vestments, copes, and other ornaments, plate, books, and specially of grails, couchers, legends, processional, hymnals, manuals, portasses and such like appertaining to the Church."

This merely requires an inventory to be delivered to the Visitors, but such inventories had recently been made the precursors of a surrender, and must be read in the light thrown on them by the subsequent action of the "Visitors," even though in some cases certain articles mentioned in them might be subsequently retained for the use of the Church.

B. *Resolutions (Interpretations) of 1561.*

In any case the directions of the Injunctions as to the "Ornaments of the Minister" were not explicit, and apparently in 1561 the Bishops prepared a paper of *Resolutions or Interpretations*. Of these there exist three contemporary MSS. (1) CCCC. cvi. p. 424, where they are entitled "*Interpretations and further considerations of certain Injunctions*," and are appended to the "*Resolutions and Orders taken by common consent of the Bishops for this present time until a Synod may be had for observation and maintenance of uniformity in matters ecclesiastical throughout all dioceses in both provinces*" (printed in Strype's *Annals*, i. c. xvii.). (2) Inner Temple Libr. Petyt MSS., 538. 38, fol. 223, "*Resolutions concerning the Injunctions*. (3) Petyt MSS., 538. 47 fol. 546. "*Declarations of Injunctions and Articles for Ministers and Readers*." This last copy is endorsed in a contemporary hand "A declaration to have been made of the Injunctions by Dr. Cox."⁹ There is evidence that actual use was made of these Resolutions or Interpretations by some of the Bishops, e.g., by Scambler of Peterboro (see Gunton's *History of Peterboro*, p. 71), by Bentham of Lichfield in 1565 (see Dixon, vi. 77 note), by Guest of Rochester at his Visitation in 1565 (*Rochester Register*, fol. 98).¹⁰ The Cambridge copy (the later) differs in some parts from the others, but in all three copies we have the following, with the variations noted below. "Item that there be used only but one apparel; as the cope in the ministration of the Lord's Supper, and the surplice in all other ministrations; and that there be no other manner and form of ministering the Sacraments, but as the service book doth

This copy is not noticed by any historian. Our knowledge of it is due to Mr. W. M. Kennedy, who is the first person to draw attention to its existence among the Petyt MSS.

¹⁰ Information supplied by Mr. W. M. Kennedy.

precisely prescribe, and with such declaration as be in the Injunctions concerning the form of the Communion bread and placing of the communion borde, &c.”¹¹

(2) *Evidence as to the practice of the Church.*

- (a) There is no evidence whatever of the wearing of the chasuble. Chasubles appear to have been generally destroyed as “monuments of superstition,” though occasional instances of their retention may occur. “Sometimes they were sold by consent of the parishioners. . . . The chasuble was given to the poor, made into a covering for the pulpit, or into cushions, or players’ coats, or doublets. Sometimes it was burnt or defaced. In one place it became the cover of the Communion Table. In another it was sold to set forward soldiers on their way.” See Gee, *Elizabethan Prayer Book*, p. 170, where see reff.

On March 5, 1566, Parker, writing to the Warden of All Souls, speaks of “*vestments and tunicles, which serve not to use at these days.*” *Correspondence*, p. 296.

- (b) Copes were also destroyed or abolished in many places. At the Visitation of the Commissioners at St. Paul’s Cathedral (August, 1559) they “enjoined and gave in command that none in the said Cathedral Church henceforth use *aliquibus coronis rasis, amisiis, aut vestibus, vocat. le coopes*, i.e. any shaven crowns, amises or cloathes, called Copes” (Strype, *Annals*, i. 170); and at the same date Grindal ordered the Prebendaries and Petty Canons of St. Paul’s “to leave off the grey amice of fur, and to use only a surplice in the service time” (Wriothesley’s *Chronicle*, ii. p. 146). See also Machyn’s *Diary* (Camden Soc.), p. 208, St. Bartholomew’s Day, 1559: “All the roods, and Maries and Johns, and many other of the church goods, both Copes, crosses, censers, altar cloths, rood cloths, books, banners, and banner-stays, wainscot, with much other gear about London,” all these, he notes, were “burned with great wonder.”

Parkhurst’s *Visitation Articles* of 1561 for Norwich ask: “Whether all altars, images, holy water stones, pictures, paintings . . . and all other superstitious and dangerous monuments, especially paintings and images in wall, book, cope, banner

¹¹ In the Petyt MSS. there are sub-headings to different sections of the resolutions, and immediately before the one cited above stands the sub-heading, *Concerning the service of the Church*, and the article that follows begins “*First that there be used,*” etc. (instead of “item”). There is also a difference at the close of the article, the form in the Petyt MSS. being shorter—“with the declaration of the Injunctions, as for example the common [communion?] bread.”

or elsewhere of the Blessed Trinity or of the Father be defaced, &c.;" *Ritual Commission*, p. 402.

Again, in 1565, Fulke preached at Cambridge against "the ministering of the same in cope or surplice," with such force that his sermon "caused the Communion to be ministered for a time either the priest or the deacon having no surplice, but in fine they waxed so hot that they would abide no such garment upon them. And further, his mentioning of copes at that time moved some so greatly that rather than they should any longer abide amongst us they made Robin Hood's pennyworth's of them, &c." Parker's *Correspondence*, p. 75.

So in 1565 Bullingham directs the Provost of King's College "to destroy a great deal of Popish stuff, as mass books, copes, vestments, candlesticks, crosses, pixes, paxes, and the brazen rood." Tomlinson, p. 51.

Other instances (before the issue of the Advertisements) in Lincolnshire, as at Grantham: "Item, the vestments, copes, albs, tunicles, and all other such baggages was defaced, and openly sold by a general consent of the whole corporation, and the money employed in setting up desks in the Church, and making a decent Communion Table, and the remnant to the poor." Peacock's *Church Furniture*, p. 87. Gee, p. 148.

- (c) On the other hand there is plenty of evidence that in some places the use of the cope was continued, *e.g.* in 1559, on September 9, at the celebration of the Holy Communion in St. Paul's Cathedral on the morrow after the French King Henry II.'s funeral service, "the Bishops were in copes on their surplices only at the ministration of the said Communion." Stow's *Chronicle*, p. 640.

At Archbishop Parker's Consecration in December of the same year, Bishop Barlow, the principal consecrator, elect of Chichester, and the Archbishop's two Chaplains, who assisted as Gospeler and Epistoler, wore copes. Bramhall's *Works*, ed. Haddan, iii. 204; see below p. 99.

In 1560 Sandys writes: "Only the Popish vestments remain in our Church, I mean the Copes, which however we hope will not last very long." *Zurich Letters*, i. 74.

In the same year "a cope of blue velvet and gold" was bought by the churchwardens for St. Mary Wolnoth, where "copes, vestments, and ornaments," had been sold the year before. See Gee, p. 158.

In 1563 a minority of the Lower House of Convocation asked "that the use of copes and surplices be taken away." Strype, *Annals*, i. 336.

In 1564 the certificate of the Vice-Dean and Prebendaries of Canterbury Cathedral states that "the Holy Communion is

ministered ordinarily the first Sunday of every month through the year. At what time the Table is set east and west. The Priest which ministereth, the Epistoler and Gospeler, at that time wear copes." Strype's *Parker*, p. 183.

In 1564 or 1565 one Shaxton says: "In many places of England the massing surplices and copes have been and are used to this day." Gee, p. 158.

In the paper known as *Varieties in the Service*, &c., it is noted (1565): "Some with surplice and copes, some with surplice alone, others with none." *Report on Eccl. Disc.* vol. iv. p. 49.

In 1566 the Lincolnshire Visitation shows that in many cases the cope was left, both before and after the issue of the Advertisements.

- (d) Even the use of the surplice was not strictly enforced. See *Varieties in the Service*, as above, and notice that in the paragraph on "Service and Prayers" it is said, "Some say with a surplice, others without a surplice;" and cf. Grindal's *Remains*, pp. 203, 209 (quoted in *Report on Eccl. Disc.* iv. p. 50), which implies that no compulsion was used. So Humphrey, in a letter to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners some time in 1565, says of wearing "a surplice, or cope, or a cornered cap," that "these substantial points are, in all places of this realm almost, neglected, the offenders either nothing or little rebuked." *State Papers, Dom. Eliz.* xxxvi. 64, quoted in *Dixon*, vi. p. 62.

II. *The Advertisements of 1566.* Chronological sketch of their production. Theories: A. that they are a taking of "other order"; B. that they are the Bishops' orders; C. that they impose a minimum.

1565. January 25th, 1565, the Queen wrote to the Archbishop (1) complaining of the open and manifest disorder by diversity of opinions, especially in the external, decent, and lawful rites and ceremonies to be used in the churches; (2) expressing her determination to have all such diversities, varieties, and novelties as are against the laws, good usages, and ordinances of our realm to be reformed and repressed; wherefore (3) she orders the Metropolitan according to the power and authority which he has under her over the province of Canterbury (and the like she will order for the province of York) to confer with the Bishops in the Commission for causes ecclesiastical, and others, and (a) ascertain what varieties, novelties, and diversities exist in doctrine, or in ceremonies and rites of the Church, or in the manners, usages, and behaviour of the clergy; (b) proceed by order, injunction, or censure, according to the order and appointment of such laws and ordinances as are provided by Act of Parliament, and the true meaning thereof, so that uniformity may

be enforced; and (c) for the future to see that none are ordained but such as will promise to observe, keep and maintain such order and uniformity in all the external rites and ceremonies, both for the Church and for their own persons, as by laws, good usages, and orders, *are already allowed*, well provided and established. Parker's *Correspondence*, p. 223.

On January 30, 1565, Parker writes to Grindal, Bishop of London, summarising the Queen's letter, and charging him to signify to the other Bishops of the province that they "inviolably see the laws and ordinances already established executed, with proceeding against the offenders by the censures of the Church." They are also to send in certificates of existing disorders by February 28. *Correspondence*, p. 227.

March 3. Parker writes to Cecil sending him "a book of Articles partly of old agreed on amongst us, and partly of late considered," calling it "a first view, not fully digested," and asking for a letter from the Queen to the Bishop of London to execute laws and injunctions. *Ib.* 233.

March 8. Parker follows this up by sending Cecil "our book which is subscribed to by the Bishops conferrers," and asks to have it presented to the Queen, adding, "if the Queen's Majesty will not authorise them, the most part be like to lie in the dust for the execution of our parties, laws be so much against our private doings. 'The Queen's Majesty with consent, &c.,' I trust shall be obeyed." *Correspondence*, p. 234.

This "book" of rules and orders is endorsed by Cecil, "*These were not authorised nor published.*" It is printed in full in Strype's *Parker*, Appendix, p. 47.

March 24, April 7, April 30, 1565. Parker writes further letters to Cecil complaining of the lack of support he receives, and recounting his dealings with Sampson and Humphrey; but these letters contain no definite allusion to the book of rules, &c. (*Correspondence*, pp. 236-241), nothing more being heard of it till the next year.

1566. Early in the year (date unknown, but before March 12) the Queen sent for Parker and Grindal, and charged them to "see her laws executed, and good orders decreed and observed." *Correspondence*, p. 273, and cf. the allusion to the Queen's "word of mouth," p. 284.

March 12. Parker writes to Cecil complaining of his difficulties and asking to have "the ordinances" returned and sanctioned "at the least way for particular apparel." *Correspondence*, p. 263.

March 12. He writes again informing Cecil of the course to be taken with the London Ministers in regard to "conformity in their ministrations and outward apparel." *Correspondence*, p. 267.

March 26. He tells him what has been done.

March 28. He writes again to Cecil asking him "to peruse

this draft of letters and the book of Advertisements" with his pen. "This form," he says, "is but newly printed, and yet stayed till I may hear your advice. I am now fully bent to prosecute this order, and to delay no longer, and I have weeded out of these Articles all such of doctrine, &c., which peradventure stayed the book from the Queen's Majesty's approbation, and have put in but *things advouchable, and, as I take them, against no law of the realm.* And where the Queen's Highness will needs have me assay with mine own authority what I can do for order, I trust I shall not be stayed hereafter, saving that I would pray your honour to have your advice to do that more prudently in this common cause which must needs be done." *Correspondence*, p. 271.

On the same day Parker wrote officially to Grindal, Bishop of London, summarising the events of the past, viz. the disorders, and the Queen's letter, and after referring to their late interview with the Queen in which he and Grindal were charged "to see her laws executed, and good orders decreed and observed," he charges Grindal "to see her Majesty's laws and injunctions duly observed" in his diocese, "*and also these our convenient orders described in these books at this present*" sent to him. He is also directed to send them to his brethren within the province. *Correspondence*, p. 272.

On the same day Parker also wrote to the Incumbents of Peculiars within the province. In the letter to the Dean of Bocking he says: "I have sent you herewith a book of certain orders agreed upon by me and other of my brethren of my province of Canterbury." J. H. Parker, *Letter to Lord Selborne*, p. 49.

The "book" referred to in all these letters was printed by Wolfe,¹² and bears the following title: "Advertisements partly for

¹² Lord Selborne (*Notes*, &c. p. 18) appears to lay stress on the fact that Wolfe was one of the printers to the Queen, quoting Strype's statement that "he was employed in printing . . . most of the public orders and books for religion in the times of Henry VIII., King Edward, and Queen Elizabeth" (*Annals*, vol. ii. p. 357). Mr. J. H. Parker (*Letter*, &c., p. 95) demurs to the inference which is apparently to be drawn from this; and not without reason, for Strype's statement is seriously inaccurate. It is true that Wolfe was made printer to the King by Edward VI. on April 19, 1547, but only for books in "Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, and all others that might be commanded" (see his patent in Rymer, xv. p. 150); and this patent continued in force after Edward's death. But in Elizabeth's reign Jugge and Cawood were appointed "printers to the Queen's Majesty" with a salary of £6 13s. 4d. by a patent of March 24, 1560, having been already employed by her before this (Cawood having previously been printer to Queen Mary), and throughout the first twenty years of her reign they were almost exclusively employed by her. Thus (to mention only their publications up to the date of Wolfe's death about 1573) they were the printers of (a) all the statutes of the realm, (b) all the Royal Proclamations without exception, (c) the English Litany of 1558; (d) the Prayer Book of 1559 (except one edition by Grafton in 1559 and another by Seres in 1565), (e) the second book of Homilies 1563, and the additional Homily added in 1571, (f) the

due order in the public administration of Common Prayers and using the holy Sacraments, and partly for the apparel of all persons ecclesiastical, by virtue of the Queen's Majesty's letters commanding the same, the 25th day of January, in the seventh year of the reign of our Sovereign Lady Elizabeth, by the Grace of God, of England, France, and Ireland Queen, Defender of the Faith, &c."

Among the advertisements included in the book the following concern the dress of the clergy during service.

"Item, in the ministration of the Holy Communion in Cathedral and Collegiate Churches, the principal minister shall use a cope, with Gospeller and Epistoler agreeably; and at all other prayers to be said at that Communion Table, to use no copes but surplices."

"Item, that the Dean and Prebendaries wear a surplice with a silk hood in the Quier: and when they preach in the Cathedral or Collegiate Church, to wear their hood."

"Item, that every minister saying any public prayers, or ministering the Sacraments, or other rites of the Church, shall wear a comely surplice with sleeves, to be provided at the charges of the parish; and that the parish provide a decent table standing on a frame, for the Communion Table."¹³

Since these requirements fall short of the First Prayer Book of Edward VI. as to the use of the ornaments of the Minister, the question arises, *What is their authority? And what is their intention?*

(A) It is claimed that they are a taking of "other order" under the proviso of the Act of Uniformity, and that therefore they have

Queen's Injunctions 1559 and the Visitation Articles for the Royal Commissioners of the same year, (g) the order about Roodlofts 1561, (h) all the special forms of prayer issued "by the authority of the Queen's Majesty," viz. forms in 1560, 1563, 1564, 1565, 1566, 1572, (i) the English Version of the XXXIX. Articles in 1563 and the edition of 1571 "put forth by the Queen's authority." Indeed, apart from the Advertisements, the authority of which is now under consideration, the only books published by Wolfe during Elizabeth's reign for which any claim to royal authority can be made, are (a) the Latin Prayer Book of 1560, and (b) the Latin edition of the XXXIX. Articles in 1563. And these are obviously accounted for by Wolfe's patent for printing Latin books. Indeed he styles himself "*Regiæ Maiest. in Latinis typographum*," and never received any patent as royal printer, save for books in Latin, Greek, and Hebrew. He was, however, employed by Archbishop Parker to print his Visitation Articles in 1563, 1567, 1569, 1573, as well as an "Admonition for the necessity of the present time" in 1560, and in his edition of Matthew Paris in 1571. So far then as any inference can be fairly drawn from the printer's name, it is distinctly against the view that the Advertisements were issued by authority of the Queen, and in favour of the view that they really rested on the authority of the Archbishop.

¹³ The text is taken from Wolfe's editions, of which there are at least three without date, and a fourth dated 1571. The text given both by Sparrow (*Collection*, p. 124) and by Cardwell (*Doc. Annals*, vol. i. p. 326) is inexact.

the force of statute law. In favour of this view the following points are urged.

- (1) The Queen's letter of January 25, 1565, is said to have been "mandative," because she ordered the Archbishop to "proceed by order, injunctions, or censures, according to the order and appointment of such laws and ordinances as are provided by Act of Parliament, and the true meaning thereof, so that uniformity may be enforced."
- (2) At the personal interview with Parker and Grindal the Queen told them not only to "see her laws executed," but also to have "good orders decreed."

It is claimed that, as the Act prescribed no formality, these would be sufficient warrant, and would justify the enforcement of the Advertisements as by authority of the Crown; and this would be sufficient, since, so far as the ornaments of the Church and Minister are concerned, the Act only required that other order should be taken "by the authority of the Queen's Majesty, with the advice, &c.," whereas according to the succeeding part of the proviso which concerns new rites or ceremonies the form was, "The Queen's Majesty may, by the like advice, &c., ordain and publish," *i.e.* in this case the action must be taken by the Queen herself, in the other it need only be by her authority.

- (3) In the title, as given above, the words "the same" are by some referred to "Advertisements," and so interpreted may be taken to claim for the Advertisements the authority of the Queen as "other order." By others, however, these words are referred to the words "due order, &c.," and "apparel, &c." But it should be observed that in either case the title is a necessarily brief summary of the preface of the Advertisements (on which see below, p. 78), and introduces no question of their authority not raised in that preface.
- (4) Grindal's official letter to the Dean and Chapter of St. Paul's (May 21, 1566) requires them to convene the clergy under their jurisdiction, and to enjoin them all, on pain of deprivation, "to prepare forthwith, and to wear, such habit and apparel as is *ordained by the Queen's Majesty's authority expressed in the treaty entitled the Advertisements, &c.*" Selborne, p. 24.
- (5) On November 15, 1573, Parker, writing to Cecil, says that "order hath been taken publicly this seven years by Commissioners according to the statute, that fonts should not be removed." This order can only refer to the Advertisements, which were published seven years before the letter was written (1566), and contained one directing "that the

font be not removed." It cannot, however, be properly maintained that this claims for the Advertisements authority "according to the Statute," for the phrase "Commissioners according to the Statute" probably refers to 1 Eliz. c. 1, the Statute by which the Commission was appointed, and not to the Act of Uniformity. [N.B. A comma is wrongly inserted after the word "Commissioners" in the Parker Society's edition of the letter. There is none in the original MS.]

- (6) In 1571 Grindal, at his Metropolitan Visitation in the Province of York, and again in 1576 in the Province of Canterbury, apparently treats the cope as illegal in parish churches, for he asks, "Whether your parson, vicar, curate, or minister, do wear any cope in your parish church or chapel, or minister the Holy Communion in any chalice heretofore used at mass, &c." *Ritual Com. Report*, p. 408; Cardwell, *Doc. Annals*, vol. i. p. 399. Similarly in 1586 Bishop Westfaling of Hereford asks whether any cope was worn in the parish church, and not a surplice only. (*Brit. Mus.*, 1368, d. 31).
- (7) The draft of Whitgift's Articles of 1584 has a marginal note on one point saying that "the Article is warranted both by the *Advertisements set out by Her Majesty's authority*, and also by the Queen's Injunctions." Selborne, p. 25. Cf. the reference to "Her Majesty's Injunctions and Advertisements" in Whitgift's *Articles for Chichester*, 1585, in Cardwell, *D. A.* ii. 25.
- (8) Hooker (letter to Whitgift) in 1586 describes them as a decree agreed upon by the Bishops and *confirmed by Her Majesty's authority*." *Works*, vol. iii. p. 587, Oxf. 1888.
- (9) The Canons of 1604 treat them as authoritative, ordering (Canon 24) that copes shall be worn in cathedral churches, &c., "according to the Advertisements published Anno 7 Eliz."
- (10) Some later writers of the seventeenth century distinctly assert that the Advertisements were a taking of other order under the proviso of the Act; e.g. Sparke, one of the Puritan representatives at the Hampton Court Conference, writing in 1607 (see Selborne, p. 13), Lestrange, *Alliance of Divine Offices*, p. 104 (published in 1655), and Heylin (who died in 1662), *History of the Reformation*, ii. 608. Cf. also Sparrow's *Rationale upon the Book of Common Prayer*, p. 337, where "Queen Elizabeth's Articles set forth in the seventh year of her reign" are referred to as giving the rule for the ornaments of the minister.

These seem to be the only direct pieces of evidence in favour of

the view that the Advertisements are a taking of "other order," for—

- (11) The fact that, according to the Visitation Articles of Bishops during the remainder of the reign, only the surplice was required in parish churches proves nothing, as the same fact holds good of Parker's *Visitation Articles* issued *before* the Advertisements were published, viz. in 1563, where he asks, "Whether your priests, curates, or ministers do use in the time of the celebration of the Divine Service to wear a surplice, prescribed by the Queen's Majesty's Injunctions and the Book of Common Prayer." *Report of Ritual Commission*, p. 403.
- (12) Nor can much weight be attached to the fact that after the issue of the Advertisements there is very little, if any, evidence of the use of the cope in parish churches—because (a) it certainly had not been generally used in them before the issue of the Advertisements, and (b) its use does not appear to have been generally enforced even in cathedrals, where the Advertisements distinctly required it. Thus at Canterbury Archbishops Parker and Grindal and other Bishops only wore surplices at the Consecration of Curteis in 1570 (see pp. 100-1); and whereas in 1563 there had been a very large number of copes remaining (*Inventories*, p. 214), at Parker's Visitation in 1573 the Dean confessed "that he had made away the copes of the church, which he confessed, because it had been agreed by the Chapter that all the copes should be made away, and that he had two of them, and paid fifteen pounds for the same." The answers, however, of the Dean and Prebendaries to the Articles of Inquiry stated that "they had still remaining a great many old copes, which were to be disposed of as the archbishop thought best" (Strype's *Parker*, Bk. iv. c. 31). In 1584, according to the Inventory then made, not one was remaining (*Inventories*, p. 234 *seq.*). See also Parker's *Visitation Articles* of 1567, and Grindal's of 1571. So in 1590 a Puritan "petition to her Majesty" says of the Bishops "they retain the surplice, *seldom the cope*" (Tomlinson, *Prayer Book*, &c., p. 135), and there is no doubt that in spite of the 24th Canon of 1604, the general use of the cope in Cathedrals had almost, if not altogether, died out by the time when the Laudian revival began. (See below, p. 85.)¹⁴

¹⁴ It should be stated for the sake of completeness that copes continued to be worn by Choirmen as well as Clergy on various State occasions, at which they were certainly not required by the Advertisements, as (a) Coronations (James I., Charles I., and all subsequent ones), royal marriages, baptisms, and funerals, e.g. Elizabeth's Funeral, 1603 (Nichols, *Progresses of Queen Elizabeth*, iii. 622), the

(B) On the other hand it is said that the Advertisements were lacking in statutory force, and were merely administrative orders issued by the Bishops on their own authority. In favour of this view the following points are urged.

- (1) The disorders to be suppressed included much more than a simple refusal to wear the ecclesiastical vestments in church. They were concerned not only with a general neglect of the Rubrics, but also with the refusal to wear the "external apparel" outside the church. Accordingly the Advertisements deal with a large number of matters entirely outside the range of the Prayer Book, and for the bulk of them whatever authority they had must have come either from the *Act of Supremacy* rather than that of Uniformity, or from the general powers of the Bishops as administrators. As a whole the Advertisements cannot have been a taking of "other order" under the proviso of the Act of Uniformity of 1559. Moreover, in the Preface to the Advertisements, where the Queen's Letter is referred to, it is said that she "hath by her letters directed unto the Archbishop of Canterbury and Metropolitan, required, enjoined, and straightly charged that. . . some orders might be taken, whereby all diversities and varieties among them of the Clergy and the people (as breeding nothing but contention, offence, and breach of common charity, and be against the laws, good usage, and ordinances of the realm) might be reformed and repressed, and brought to one manner of conformity throughout the whole realm," i.e. Parker refers to the Queen's Letter as his warrant for enforcing the existing law, not for making a new law.

(2) There is no clear reference to the proviso of the Act in Christening of Princess Mary, 1605 (Nichols, *Progresses of James I.*, i. 512), the Funeral of Henry, Prince of Wales, 1612 (*ib.* ii. 495), the Marriage of Princess Elizabeth, 1613 (*ib.* 547), the Funeral of James I., 1627 (*ib.* iv. 1043), and the Marriage of Princess Mary, 1641 (*Hierurgia*, i. 196); (b) State services, such as that held when the Queen visited St. Paul's after the defeat of the Armada, 1588, when she "was received by the Bishop of London, the Dean of St. Paul's, and other of the Clergy to the number of more than fifty, all in rich copes" (Nichols, ii. 539); at the opening of Parliament in 1597, when the Queen was "received at Westminster Abbey by the Dean of Her Majesty's Chapel, with all the company of the Chapel, and the Dean of Westminster, with his brethren and company in copes" (*ib.* iii. 415). On the occasion of the French Ambassador's visit to Westminster Abbey in 1605, "the Choirmen vested in their rich copes, with their choristers sang three several anthems" (Hacket's *Life of Williams*, i. 210, quoted in *Hierurgia*, i. 181). When James I. visited St. Paul's in state for evensong in 1620, he was received by the Dean and Chapter of that Church, being all in their rich copes. . . . The gentlemen of the King's Chapel and the Quire of Paul's were likewise all in rich copes" (Nichols, iv. 601); and on the occasion of the King's visit to Cambridge in 1624 "the Choir sang anthems in the Chapel of Trinity College in rich copes and vestments" (*ib.* 1009).

any of the correspondence preceding or following the issue of the Advertisements. Throughout, the question appears to be one of administration of existing law rather than of a change in the law whereby a new rule having the force of statute law was to be made. The only possible allusion to the proviso in the Queen's Letter of January 25 is that quoted on p. 75 as relied on to show that it was "mandative." But this is capable of an entirely different interpretation—"injunctions, censures, and orders" might all be merely administrative directions; and the reference to the Act of Parliament may apply to the Act of Supremacy equally well with the Act of Uniformity, for by it ecclesiastical jurisdiction was annexed to the Crown "for the visitation of the ecclesiastical state and persons, and for reformation, order, and correction of the same, and of all manner of errors, heresies, schisms, abuses, offences, contempts, and enormities," and the Sovereign was empowered to assign commissioners to exercise this ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Further, it is pointed out that those ordained for the future are, according to the Queen's Letter, "to keep order and uniformity in all the external rites and ceremonies as by laws, good usages, and orders, are *already* allowed, &c" (see p. 72), which does not look as if a new order was then contemplated.

- (3) Parker's language in his correspondence with Cecil, his letters to Grindal and the Dean of Bocking (quoted on p. 73), and the changes made in the Advertisements before publication, imply that they were wanting in royal authority, which he had desired to secure for them. See the letters quoted above, and compare the draft "not authorised nor published" with the Advertisements as issued.
- (a) The title in the draft was apparently "Ordinances accorded by the Archbishop of Canterbury in his province" (Strype's *Parker*, p. 158), as published it was "Advertisements, &c." (It is, however, uncertain whether the title in the draft was the Archbishop's own or whether it was added by Cecil.)
- (b) The draft began as follows: "The Queen's Majesty of her godly state . . . hath, by the assent of the metropolitan, and with certain other her Commissioners in causes ecclesiastical decreed certain rules and orders to be used as hereafter followeth. Not yet prescribing these rules as Laws equivalent with the eternal Word of God, and as of necessity to bind the consciences of her subjects in the nature of the said Laws, considered in themselves, or as they should add any efficacy of more holiness to the ministration of prayer and Sacraments, but as constitutions mere ecclesiastical,

without any vain superstition, as positive Laws in discipline, concerning decency, distinction and order for the time."

In the published form, "The Queen's Majesty of her godly zeal . . . hath by her letters directed unto the Archbishop of Canterbury and metropolitan, required, enjoined and straightly charged that with the assistance and conference had with other Bishops, namely such as be in commission for causes ecclesiastical, some orders might be taken, whereby all diversities and varieties among them of the clergy and the people . . . might be reformed and repressed . . . whereupon by diligent conference and communication in the same, and at last by assent and consent of the persons before said, these orders and rules ensuing have been thought meet and convenient to be used and followed, not yet prescribing these rules as Laws equivalent, &c. . . . but as temporal orders mere ecclesiastical, without any vain superstition, and as rules in some part of discipline concerning decency, distinction and order for the time."

- (c) Whereas in the draft "ordinances" the language implied that they were an order for the whole Church (*cf.*, however, the title, as above), the Advertisements as published were definitely limited to the Province of Canterbury. See No. 4: "All licences for preaching, granted out by the Archbishop and Bishops *within the Province of Canterbury, &c.*;" the words in italics having no place in the original draft.

N.B. There is no trace whatever of any publication of the Advertisements for the Province of York. The Queen in her letter of January 25th, 1565, had said of her directions, "the like we will order for the Province of York," and on April 28th, 1566, Parker writes to Cecil, "the Queen's Majesty willed my Lord of York to declare her pleasure determinately to have the order go forward." *Correspondence*, p. 280. But nothing more is heard of this; and it is remarkable that Grindal at his metropolitanical Visitation of the Province of York in 1571, while frequently referring to the "Injunctions," makes no appeal whatever to the Advertisements, and this is all the more marked, because in his "Articles to be put in execution within the Archdeaconry of York," 1571, he actually *adopts the very words of the Advertisements*. "Item that every minister . . . Communion Table" (see p. 74) *without mentioning them by name*. Grindal's *Remains*, p. 155. Again, there is no reference to them, though there is to the Injunctions, in Sandys' Articles to be inquired of within the Province of York in 1578. It should be stated, however, that in the Articles of Inquiry issued within Darlington ward, Durham, by Richard Barnes, Bishop of Durham, and others, "the Q.'s Highness's

Commissioners for the hearing, ordering and determining of Causes Ecclesiastical within the said diocese of Durham and every part thereof, by virtue of her Highness said Commission to them under the Great Seal of England directed," inquire, "Whether there be any persons, vicars, curates, or other persons ecclesiastical that wear lay apparel, great ruffs, great bumbasted breeches, skalinges, or scabulonious cloaks, or gowns after the lay fashion, and contrary to the Advertisements and Injunctions." (E. Wheatley Balme, *The Church and the Ornaments Rubric*, p. 78).

- (d) Other important variations consist in the omission of passages giving authority to the Bishop to deal with offenders. See the draft in Strype's *Parker*, App., p. 51.
- (4) Humphrey, in writing to Cecil, apparently in April, 1566, petitions that "the Articles of the Archbishop may some ways be mitigated *before such time as they be fully confirmed*." This, which is certainly subsequent to the publication of the Advertisements, assumes that they are lacking in Royal authority. *State Papers, Dom. Eliz.*, vol. xxx. No. 63. [N.B. Strype, *Life of Parker*, Bk. III. c. ix., quotes a part of the letter, but omits the opening "petition."]
- (5) Subsequent references to the Advertisements by Parker and others imply that they were of less authority than *e.g.* the Injunctions, which are always spoken of as "the Queen's Injunctions," whereas when the Advertisements are mentioned they are spoken of as "these our convenient orders," or "the Advertisements lately set forth by public authority." (Parker's *Visitation Articles for Norwich*, 1567, and for *Canterbury*, 1569. Cardwell, *Doc. Annals*, i. 355); or simply "the book of the Advertisements" (Canons of 1571). "The Commissioners' Advertisements" (Second Admonition to Parliament, see *Puritan Manifestoes*, p. 91); the "Advertisements of the Bishops," *Zurich Letters*, ii. pp. 149, 151, 163; or "the Archbishop's book," Earl's *Diary* (Univ. Lib. Camb. MS. Mm. i. 29), 1566, immediately after publication.

Moreover, at his Metropolitan Visitation of 1567, the year after their publication, although the Archbishop sent to Norwich the Advertisements and his table of prohibited degrees along with his Articles of Visitation (see Dixon, vi. p. 195-6), yet, in his "Articles to be inquired of . . . in all and singular Cathedral and Collegiate Churches within his province of Canterbury," he makes no allusion to them whatever, while asking "whether they use seemly or priestly garments according as they are commanded by the Queen's Majesty's Injunctions to do," and whether "your divine service be used, and your Sacraments ministered in manner

and form prescribed by the Queen's Majesty's Injunctions and none other way?" Cardwell, *Doc. Ann.* i. 338-9. As the Advertisements had dealt with these very points, is it conceivable that he could have omitted all reference to them if he regarded them as authoritative?

- (6) Grindal writes to Zanchy (apparently in 1571): "Whereas in this form of religion of which I have spoken, drawn up by King Edward, there were many commands respecting the habits properly adapted to ministers of the Church, and also concerning other things which some good men wish to be abolished or amended, it was forbidden by the authority of the law that anyone should meddle with this matter. Yet *the law itself allowed the Queen's Majesty, with the advice of some of the Bishops, to alter some things. Nothing however of the law is either altered or diminished;* nor, as far as I know, is there a Bishop who does not himself obey the prescribed rules, and also lead or persuade the rest to do the same."

This appears to be a definite and categorical statement on the subject, but in the same letter Grindal says that "in public prayers and every sacred administration, besides this ordinary dress, the ecclesiastical discipline requires the Minister to wear a linen garment called by a new appellation a surplice." *Remains*, p. 339.

- (7) A comparison of the language of the Advertisements, which carefully abstain from claiming royal authority, with that used in those cases where the Queen took further order in rites and ceremonies under the proviso, suggests that had the intention been to take "other order" the form would have been more authoritative. See for instance—
- (a) The order about wafer bread appended to the Injunctions, which, as we learn from a letter of Parker's to Cecil (*Correspondence*, p. 375)¹⁵ was regarded by the Queen as a taking of further order. Cardwell, *Doc. Ann.*, i. 234.

This with the order "for tables in the church," is not mixed up in the middle of miscellaneous directions under another authority (as are the Advertisements concerning the vesture of the clergy), but stands at the close of the Injunctions, not numbered with them, but quite separate, and practically as a distinct document in a different form, with the direct statement, "It is ordered, &c." See Cardwell, *Doc. Ann.*, p. 234.

- (b) The order for the new Table of Lessons.

For this the Queen issued Letters in her own name under the Great Seal to her Commissioners for causes ecclesiastical

¹⁵ Cf. *Zurich Letters*, ii. p. 161.

in the most formal manner possible, (i.) referring in the preamble to the proviso in the Act of Uniformity, (ii.) directing the Commissioners to revise the Table of Lessons, &c., and (iii.) ending as follows: "And for the publication of that, which you shall order, we will and require you, the Archbishop of Cant., to see the same put in execution throughout your province, and that you, the rest of our Commissioners before-mentioned, prescribe the same to the Archbishop now nominated of York, to be in like manner set forth in that province, and that the alteration of anything hereby ensuing, be quietly done, without show of any innovation in the Church. And these our letters shall be your sufficient warrant in this behalf. Given under our signet at our Palace of Westminster the 22nd day of January, the third year of our reign."

Moreover, the new Calendar was at once inserted in the Prayer Book in the place of the old one¹⁶; whereas after the issue of the Advertisements which (on the hypothesis that they are authoritative) involved a new rule which the clergy were bound to obey, no change whatever was made in the ornaments' rubric.

- (8) Throughout the controversy with the Puritans, the latter always assume that the ornaments of the First Prayer Book of Edward VI. are still the legal ones, and charge the Bishops with inconsistency in enforcing surplice and cope, and discarding the other articles required. See the language quoted above in Section 2, p. 55. If the Advertisements had abrogative and prohibitive statutory force, there was a complete and satisfactory answer forthcoming which might have easily been put forward. But there is no trace that it was ever suggested by Whitgift or any other of the Bishops who replied to the Puritans.

(C) But even if those of the Advertisements now in question involved a taking of "other order," it has been urged that they are not necessarily *prohibitive*, save in the one case where a prohibition is expressed,¹⁷ but that their intention was to enforce a minimum in matters of ornament.

In favour of this it is alleged that—

- (a) A comparison of the rubrical directions of the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI. shows the form they would

¹⁶ A similar course was followed in 1604, when the alterations made in the Book of Common Prayer were authorised by Letters Patent expressly referring to the power granted to the Crown by the proviso of Elizabeth's Act of Uniformity, and directing the necessary changes to be made in the printed text of the Prayer Book. See Cardwell's *Conferences*, p. 217.

¹⁷ "at all other prayers to be said at that Communion table to use no copes but surplices."

probably have taken had the intention been to prohibit anything more than a surplice at the celebration of the Holy Communion: "Shall use neither alb, vestment, nor cope *but* a surplice only."

- (b) A parallel instance of a minimum is found in the directions as to Holy Communion in cathedral churches. The Prayer Book definitely required that in cathedral and collegiate churches the clergy should communicate every Sunday at the least unless hindered, &c.; the Advertisements require the Holy Communion to be ministered *once a month* at the least; and all the clergy are to receive *four times a year*. Parker at his Visitation in the next year was content with "thrice in the year." Cardwell, *D. A. i.* 339. And Grindal (1576) puts up with "at the least *once* in every year." *Remains*, p. 180. If an illegal relaxation of the definite requirement of the Prayer Book could be made in one case, as a concession, why should not the lowering of the standard in the other case be regarded merely as a concession also? Cf. also another instance of relaxation of the law "for peace and quietness" in Parker's *Correspondence*, p. 460, where mention is made of the way in which Grindal had relaxed the rule about the use of wafer bread, which was required under the "further order" taken by the Queen in accordance with the provision of the Act of Uniformity.

III. *The Canons of 1604.*

The requirements of these as to the dress of the clergy in church corresponded generally with those of the Advertisements; but it is to be noticed that Canon 58 adds hoods for graduates in parish churches, and permits tippets for non-graduates. The following are the Canons bearing on the subject.

24. *Copes to be worn in cathedral churches by those that administer the Communion.*

In all cathedral and collegiate churches the Holy Communion shall be administered upon principal feast days, sometimes by the Bishop, if he be present, and sometimes by the Dean, and at some times by a Canon or Prebendary, the principal Minister using a decent cope and being assisted with the Gospeller and Epistler agreeably according to the Advertisements published Anno 7 Eliz.

25. *Surplices and hoods to be worn in cathedral churches when there is no Communion.*

In the time of Divine Service and Prayers in all cathedral and collegiate churches when there is no Communion, it shall be sufficient to wear surplices, saving that all Deans,

Masters and Heads of collegiate churches, Canons, and Prebendaries, being graduates, shall daily, at the times both of prayer and preaching, wear with their surplices such hoods as are agreeable to their degrees.

58. *Ministers reading Divine Service and administering the Sacraments to wear surplices, and Graduates therewithal hoods.*

Every Minister saying the Public Prayers, or ministering the Sacraments or other rites of the Church, shall wear a decent and comely surplice, with sleeves, to be provided at the charge of the parish. And if any question arise touching the matter, decency, or comeliness thereof, the same shall be decided by the discretion of the Ordinary. Furthermore, such Ministers as are Graduates shall wear upon their surplices, at such times, such hoods as by the orders of the Universities are agreeable to their degrees, which no Minister shall wear (being no Graduate) under pain of suspension. Notwithstanding, it shall be lawful for such Ministers as are not Graduates to wear upon their surplices, instead of hoods, some decent tippet of black, so it be not silk.

The requirement of the 24th Canon (*Copes to be worn in Cathedral Churches, &c.*) seems to have been very imperfectly obeyed, so far as the evidence at present available goes. Heylin, it is true, speaks generally of copes being "brought again into the service of the Church" (*History of the Presbyterians*, p. 376), and Collier says that "the use of copes was revived" (*Eccl. Hist.*, vii. p. 311); but Archbishop Bancroft, in his Articles for the Cathedral Church of Wells in 1605, takes no notice whatever of the cope (Wilkins, *Concilia*, iv. 415), and although in his "orders enjoined . . . in his metropolitical visitation Anno 1608 to be observed by the Dean and Chapter of Canterbury," he required "that the Epistle and Gospel be every Sunday and holy day read, according to the Book of Common Prayer, in some convenient place near the communion table, and in copes" (*ib.* 436), yet when Archbishop Laud began his metropolitical visitation in 1634 seven of the Prebendaries of Canterbury presented "the want of copes" in their answers to the visitation articles, although there had apparently been a recent gift of "a scarlet cope lined with miniver left unto the Church by Dr. Clarck" (*Inventories of Christ Church, Canterbury*, 248, 256). Again, in his abstract of his metropolitical visitation, Laud writes

as follows: of *Lincoln*, "the copes and vestments are embezzelled and none remain"; of *Norwich*, "the copes are fair, but want mending"; of *Worcester*, "they have no copes, but are ordered to buy some"; of *Gloucester*, "many things amiss, no copes"; of *Winchester*, "they have no copes." In his Injunctions for *Chichester* there occurs the following: "Item, that you provide copes fitting for the service of your Cathedral by one a year, until you be sufficiently furnished with them." At *Hereford* the residentiaries were required to officiate on Sundays and holy days "in their copes" (Prynne, *Canterbury's Doom*, p. 81). We hear of copes also as in use about the same time at *Lichfield* and *York* (*A Topographical Excursion in the Year 1634*, quoted in *Hierurgia*, i. 188), and earlier at *Durham*, where in 1626 at the consecration of White, Bishop of Carlisle, the Epistle and Gospel were read by John Cosin and H. Wickham "in the king's copes" (Cosin's *Works*, i. 85). Still earlier, in 1617 it is recorded that the vicar "gave a rich cope" to Christ Church, Hants (see M. Walcot's *Canons Ecclesiastical*, &c, p. xii.).

The provisions of the 58th Canon, requiring surplices to be used in parish churches, were likewise ignored in many places. Thus some of the clergy of the diocese of Lincoln are said to have gone on for twenty years, with the connivance of the Bishop, without wearing a surplice (Laud's *Works*, v. 310). Mather of Toxteth was finally suspended for nonconformity "upon an information that he had not worn the surplice for fifteen years" (Neal, *History of the Puritans*, ii. 275). And the Visitation Articles issued after the Laudian revival had begun show clearly how prevalent the neglect had been. Thus Cosin, in his Visitation Articles of 1627, asks, "Does he [the minister] not only sometimes wear, or usually wear, but always wear and never omit the wearing of, a surplice when he readeth divine service, either morning or evening, or when he administereth the Sacraments, and performeth any other part of his priestly or ministerial function in the Church?" And Montague, Bishop of Norwich, asks in 1638: "Doth your minister officiate Divine Service in one place upon set times, in the habit and apparel of his order, with a surplice, a hood, a gown, a tippet; not in a cloak or sleeveless jacket, or horseman's coat? for such I have known." So Bishop Wren, in 1636 "commanded and enjoined all ministers to preach constantly in their hood and surplice. And the parishioners of Knatshall wanting a surplice, he did by his officers, in the year 1637, enjoin the churchwardens there that no prayers should be read in that church till they had

got a surplice, which they not getting for the space of two Lord's days after, had no prayers during that time there" (*Articles of Impeachment*).

IV *The Revision of the Prayer Book in 1661-2.*

An account of the changes then made, so far as it is material, has been given in the earlier part of this memorandum. In considering the meaning of the Rubric it must be borne in mind that—

- (a) The Presbyterians at the Savoy Conference, referring to the Rubric of the existing book (1559 and 1604), noted that "this Rubric seemeth to bring back the cope, alb, &c., and other vestments forbidden by the Common Prayer Book 5 & 6 Edward VI. and so our reasons alleged against ceremonies under our 18th general exception,¹⁸ we desire it may be wholly left out." To this the Bishops replied: "For the reasons given in our answer to the 18th general, whither you refer us, we think fit that the Rubric continue as it is."

The answer to the 18th general dealt (as the objection had done) specially with the surplice, the sign of the cross, and kneeling, and nothing is said in it of any vestment other than the surplice. See Cardwell, *Conferences*, pp. 310, 314, 345, 351.

- (b) Baxter, who had in 1661 spoken of the Elizabethan Rubric as "seeming to bring back the cope, alb, &c.," in 1668 wrote as follows: "The Rubric for the old ornaments which were in use in the second year of Edward VI. be put out." Sylvester's *Life of Baxter*, part iii. p. 39. Quoted in *Report of Comm. on Eccl. Discipline*, vol. iii. p. 5.
- (c) Wren notes that there was "somewhat in that Act (*i.e.* 2 Edward VI.) which may not now be used."
- (d) Cosin's notes show that he was fully aware what the ornaments of the minister were under the Rubric. In the "2nd Series" of his notes written in a Prayer Book of 1638, he gives the Rubrics of the First Prayer Book pretty fully, and after quoting the words of Elizabeth's Act, adds "which other order, so qualified as is here appointed to be, was never yet made." *Works*, v. p. 230. In the 3rd Series (made about 1640) he gives the Rubrics fully, and, referring to Elizabeth's Act of Uniformity, says, "the Parliament thought fit not to continue this last order (*i.e.* that of 1552), but to restore the first again, which since that time was

¹⁸ In this was contained the following: "That public worship may not be celebrated by any Minister that does not wear a surplice."

never altered by any other law, and therefore is still in force at this day." *Works*, v. pp. 438-440. In the 1st Series copied by him from Hayward (in a Prayer Book of 1619) the same view is taken; but there is added by Cosin himself at a later date the following: "But the Act of Parliament, I see, refers to the Canon, and until such time as other order shall be taken."

- (e) The change in the Ornaments Rubric in 1662 made its wording conform to that of the Act of Parliament of 1559, but deliberately stopped short and ignored the limitation of the proviso.

Why was this, and what is its effect?

In the decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in *Kidsdale v. Clifton*, it is expressly stated that "the Rubric from 1566 to 1662 had the same operation as if it had been in law expressed in these words: Provided always, that such ornaments of the Church and of the Ministers thereof shall be retained and be in use as were in this Church of England by authority of Parliament in the second year of King Edward VI., *except that the surplice shall be used by the Ministers of the Church at all time of their public ministrations, and the alb, vestment, or tunic shall not be used, nor shall a cope be used except at the administration of the Holy Communion in Cathedral and Collegiate Churches;*" and in the view of the Court the amended Rubric of 1662 must be read in the same way; the words italicised above being practically read into the Rubric and regarded as giving the law governing the dress of the Minister in church.

If, however, it was the intention of the Revisers of 1662 to constitute this the authoritative rule, it is difficult to understand why they did not either (1) state it plainly, introducing such words into the Rubric; for the Advertisements, to which according to this view the clergy would have to refer for their regulations, were at that time difficult to obtain, and were not republished (save in Sparrow's *Collection*, 1st ed. 1661); or (2) refer to the Canons for the directions there given as to vesture, in the same way as is done in the Rubric before the Communion Office in the case of a person repelled from the Sacrament.¹⁹

Neither of these two courses was followed, but the words of the Rubric were deliberately altered so as to make them correspond with the words of the Elizabethan Act of Uniformity, stopping short of the reference to the taking of "other order." This of itself seems to exclude any reference to the Advertisements as authoritative in the future, whatever may have been the case in the past; for to the contention that, were it thereby intended

¹⁹ Compare the suggestion made in 1689: "Mem. A Canon to specify the vestments"; see above, p. 49.

to abrogate the provisions of the Advertisements, it would have been necessary to say so in express terms, it may be replied that by the same reasoning it would have been necessary for the Advertisements to abrogate in express terms the requirements of the 25th section of the Elizabethan Act of Uniformity (see *Report of Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline*, Evidence, vol. iii. p. 4).

On the other hand, it must be noted that no attempt whatever was made to enforce the use of any other vesture than the surplice. This alone was to be provided at the charge of the parish (Canon 58 of 1604), and to this alone the Visitation Articles of Bishops refer after the revision of 1662 as well as before: indeed from the early years of Elizabeth, previous to the issue of the Advertisements. Even the use of the cope in cathedrals must have died out very soon (except in Durham, where it was used till 1759),²⁰ if indeed it was ever introduced into them generally after the Restoration.²¹ Nor does any clergyman appear to have introduced the use of either cope or chasuble into a parish church until within the last fifty years,²² although a number of representative writers on the Prayer Book and Ecclesiastical Law plainly stated that they were the legal vestments of the clergy. So Nicholl, *Commentary on the Book of Common Prayer*, 1710; Wheatley, *Rational Illustration of the Book of Common Prayer*, 1710; Bishop Gibson, *Codex Juris Eccl. Anglic.* 1713; Burn, *Ecclesiastical Law*, 1809; Dr. Stephens, *Book of Common Prayer, with Notes*, 1849.

Since the judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the Ridsdale case was delivered in May, 1877, the Ornaments Rubric has been the subject of frequent investigations

²⁰ See Gyll's *Diary* quoted in the notes to Cosin's *Correspondence*, i. p. 170.

²¹ There appears to be no direct evidence of the use of the cope in any cathedral after the Restoration, except Durham and Norwich, where one was given by the High Sheriff (see Blomefield's *Topographical History of Norfolk*, iv. 6). The very complete inventories of the goods belonging to Canterbury Cathedral in 1662, 1689, 1735, 1745, 1752, contain no mention whatever of copes (see *Inventories, &c.*, p. 274 *seq.*). Copes were, however, in use in the Chapel Royal in 1675 (see Calendar of State Papers. Dom. Series, Charles II., vol. xvii. p. 178); they were also used at Westminster Abbey on some occasions of State, e.g. not only at coronations, but also at funerals, as those of the Dukes of Albemarle (1670), Buckingham (1721), and Marlborough (1722), and also at that of King George II. in 1760 (see *Hierurgia*, i. 213 *seq.*).

²² It should be stated that a fellow of Balliol, W. Wright, M.A. (1789), testifies that Dr. Theophilus Leigh always wore a special vestment when celebrating the Holy Communion at Huntspill (Dioc. Bath and Wells), where he was Rector (1767-1785). See Chr. Wordsworth, *Social Life in the English Universities*, p. 728. Reference should also be made to the fact that in the Inventory of Church Goods at Bledlow (Bucks) in 1783 an alb is mentioned. See the *Transactions of St. Paul's Ecclesiol. Soc.* v. 229-250. One of our body remembers Dr. Thos. Jessop, Vicar (from 1839) of Wighill near Tadcaster, wearing an alb on communion Sundays and preaching in it, circa 1850.

and discussions, which have, in our opinion, thrown new light upon it. See *e.g.* Dixon, *History*, vol. vi. p. 104, and Gee, *Elizabethan Prayer Book*, p. 167.

We have, therefore, thought it worth while to spend a considerable time in summarising and discussing all the evidence which, as far as we know, is now available. Some of the facts and arguments to which we have drawn attention were not brought before the Court; and the point of view from which the old evidence is now regarded by historical inquirers differs considerably from that from which it was regarded more than thirty years ago. The policy and methods of action in ecclesiastical matters followed by Queen Elizabeth and her advisers are better understood; and it is recognised that their proceedings in the struggle with Puritanism, in the course of which the Advertisements were issued, aimed at securing a minimum of decency and order, rather than compliance, in all cases, with the full requirements of the law.

We feel bound to state that our own study of the facts leads us to the conclusion that the Ornaments Rubric cannot rightly be interpreted as excluding the use of all vestments for the clergy other than the surplice in Parish Churches and, in Cathedral and Collegiate Churches, the surplice, hood, and cope.

As regards the Ornaments of a Bishop, the judges in the Ridsdale case thought it right to state, at the outset of their judgment, that they did "not propose to express any opinion upon the vestures proper to be worn by Bishops, as to which separate considerations may arise" (*The Folkestone Ritual Case*, p. 702, London, 1878). The question of the legal vesture and insignia of Bishops under the Ornaments Rubric, which raises in principle the question discussed above, is made the subject of the next chapter. It may suffice to remark at this point that the Advertisements do not appear to refer to the liturgical dress of the Bishop, except indirectly when he is acting as the "principal minister" at holy Communion in the Cathedral Church (see p. 74).²³

²³ The absence of any specific direction as to liturgical dress is made more significant by the presence of one in the section entitled *Articles for Outward Apparel of Persons Ecclesiastical*: "First, that all Archbishops and Bishops do use and continue their accustomed apparel."

CHAPTER III.

THE ORNAMENTS OF A BISHOP IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.
PP. 91-107.

§ 1. *The Bishop, considered as a "Minister" under the Ornaments Rubric, is to wear, besides his rochet, a surplice or alb, and a cope or vestment, and to have a pastoral staff.* Pp. 92-3.

§ 2. *The "rest of the Episcopal habit" which a Bishop was ordered in 1662 to put on over his rochet, at the time of his consecration, was probably a chimere with a scarf or tippet. Evidence from Scotland. The use of the chimere as a vestment of ministration perhaps dates from the time of Bancroft.* Pp. 94-6.

§ 3. *Usage in the reign of Henry VIII. and Edward VI. as illustrated from Cranmer's Registers. Cranmer's blessing of the pallium for York. Hooper's Consecration. Use of other ornaments besides the cope up to 1552.* Pp. 96-8.

§ 4. *Elizabethan and later usage fell short of the letter of the law and cannot furnish a consistent interpretation of it; but it did not go beyond the use of rochet (episcopal surplice), cope, and chimere, and perhaps pastoral staff (at consecrations). Evidence from Parker's and later Registers. Precedent of his own consecration. He adopts the surplice alone in consecrating Curteis at Canterbury (1570). Disuse of the cope and staff. What is meant by Episcopal insignia? Evidence from York Registers adds nothing to our knowledge. Legal position of the pastoral staff.* Pp. 98-104.

§ 5. *The legal position of the mitre. Disused by Cranmer at St. Paul's in 1549. It may have been used by him in consecrating Bishops up to 1552. Meaning of "redimitus." Later traces.* Pp. 104-7.

CONCLUSION: P. 107.

Legislation as to vestments is a question of expediency rather than of principle.

§ 1. *The Bishop, considered as a "Minister" under the Ornaments Rubric, is to wear, besides his rochet, a surplice or alb, and a cope or vestment, and to have a pastoral staff.*

The first service books of the reign of Edward VI. viz. the Prayer Book of 1549 and the Ordinal of 1550, described some at least of the Ornaments of a Bishop (1) in *Certain Notes*, &c., at the end of the section *Of Ceremonies*, which followed the service for the First Day of Lent; and (2) in the rubrics for *Form of Consecrating of an Archbishop or Bishop*. It will be also noticed that the limitations contained in the *Preface* and in the section on *Ceremonies* to which attention has been already drawn (ch. II. § 2) did not originally apply to the Ordinal, which was a separate book.

According to the latter, a Bishop elect is to be presented, having upon him a surplice and cope, by two Bishops being also in surplices and copes, and having their pastoral staves in their hands. No change of vesture is ordered, but a pastoral staff is put into the newly consecrated Bishop's hand by the Archbishop with the words: "Be to the flock of Christ," &c. Nothing, however, is said as to the dress or insignia of the Archbishop or a consecrating Bishop. Further, "whensoever the Bishop shall celebrate the Holy Communion in the Church, or execute any other public ministration, he shall have upon him," according to the *Certain Notes*, "beside his rochette, a surplice or alb, and a cope or vestment; and also his pastoral staff in his hand, or else borne or holden by his chaplain."

It is clear that a rochet was taken for granted as the foundation of a Bishop's dress, and that over it he might wear (perhaps according to his own choice) either a surplice and cope, or an alb and vestment, probably usually in that collocation. We find, however, some notices of the use of an alb with the cope.

What is the rule now? Are we to consider a Bishop as a "Minister" under the present Ornaments Rubric?

There were no rubrics as to the Bishop's vesture in the revised Ordinal of 1552, which was reissued in 1559. The only reference to the subject was in the two divergent Ornaments Rubrics which were introduced in those years, into the place where the rubric under discussion now stands, just before the commencement of Morning Prayer.

The first Ornaments Rubric, that of 1552, clearly described a Bishop as a "Minister," obviously in the sense of a celebrant or officiant, as follows: "And here it is to be noted that the Minister at the time of the Communion and at all other times in his ministration, shall use neither Alb, Vestment, nor Cope; but,

being Archbishop or Bishop, he shall have and wear a rochet, and, being a Priest or Deacon, he shall have and wear a surplice only."

The second Ornaments Rubric, that of 1559, was clearly based upon the first, although it took a different line. It begins with exactly the same words, including the crucial term "Minister": "And here it is to be noted that the minister at the time of the communion, and at all other times in his ministration, shall use" —, and it then proceeds, "such ornaments in the church as were in use by authority of parliament in the second year of the reign of King Edward the VI., according to the act of parliament set in the beginning of this book." The words of the statute 1 Elizabeth, here referred to, are slightly different, but, in our opinion, equivalent. They have been, as is well known, adopted as the form of the present rubric: "And here it is to be noted that such ornaments of the church, and of the ministers thereof, at all times of their ministration, shall be retained and be in use, as were in this Church of England," &c.

It follows from this that the word "Minister" throughout these rubrics includes an Archbishop or Bishop in his capacity as celebrant or officiant,¹ and that a Bishop legally ought to wear at "all times of his ministration" a rochet, with either (1) a surplice and cope, or (2) an alb and vestment, or (3) an alb and cope, and to have a pastoral staff. Canon 24 of 1604 enjoins the wearing of a cope by the Bishop when he administers the Holy Communion in a Cathedral or Collegiate Church. It may be questioned, however, whether this prohibits him from wearing an alb and vestment, if he prefers it, as the rubric of 1662 is later.

The meaning of the word "vestment" is discussed in an Appendix to this Report, p. 108. It of course implies a chasuble, but any further meaning is uncertain.

In any case there is no hint that the tunicle and dalmatic were to be retained as part of the "vestment" of a Bishop, and it would, in our opinion, be unsafe to infer it. The tunicle (which was at this time practically equivalent to the dalmatic) was, however, specified as worn by the assistants. See Ch. II. sec. 4, 1.

¹ The preface to the Ordinal similarly speaks of "three orders of ministers in Christ's Church, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons," and so, in the Collect for the consecration of a Bishop, we have: "Almighty God giver of all good things, who by thine Holy Spirit hast appointed divers orders of Ministers in thy Church: Mercifully behold this thy servant now called to the work and ministry of a Bishop," &c. So we have in the Bidding Prayer (Canon 55 of 1604): "Ye shall also pray for the Ministers of God's Holy Word and Sacraments, as well Archbishops and Bishops, as other Pastors and Curates."

§2. The “rest of the *Episcopal habit*” which a Bishop was ordered in 1662 to put on over his rochet, at the time of his consecration, was probably a chimere with scarf or tippet. Evidence from Scotland. The use of the chimere as a vesture of ministration perhaps dates from the time of Bancroft.

The Ordinal of 1662 differed from that previously in use in ordering that a Bishop elect should be presented “vested with his Rochet,” and that after the examination he should “put on the rest of the Episcopal habit.” This cannot be either the Cope or the Vestment, as they were not specially episcopal. It is doubtless the Chimere, with a Scarf or Tippet, such as was put on by Archbishop Parker immediately after his consecration (17 December, 1559), which was also a common dress for Bishops engaged in preaching in Queen Elizabeth’s reign. The passage from Parker’s Register treats the “episcopal surplice,” by which we may understand the rochet, and chimere (“crimera”) as the “episcopalis amictus.” See Chapter I. §7, where the history of the chimere is summarised. The record runs as follows:—“Finitis tandem peractisque sacris egreditur per borealem orientalis sacelli partis portam Archiepiscopus quatuor illis comitatus episcopis qui eum consecraverant, et confestim eisdem ipsis stipatus episcopis per eandem revertitur portam albo episcopali superpelliceo Crimeraque (ut vocant) ex nigro serico indutus, circum collum vero collare quoddam ex preciosis pellibus sabellinis (vulgo *Sables* vocant) consutum gestabat. Pari quoque modo Cicestrensis et Herefordensis suis episcopalibus amictibus, superpelliceo sc. et crimera, uterque induebatur. D. Coverdallus vero et Bedfordie suffraganeus togis solum modo talaribus utebantur” (Printed in Haddan’s Edition of *Bramhall Works* A. C. L. iii. p. 205). The conclusion here put forward is supported by the *Order for the Apparel of Churchmen in Scotland*, issued by Charles I. on 15 October, 1633, in exercise of powers given him by Act III. of the Scottish Parliament of that year (*Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland*, vol. v. p. 21, folio 1817, referred to in Murray’s Dictionary s.v. *Chimere*). This *Order* requires Bishops to provide themselves with “a chymer (that is a sattin or taffetie gown without lining or sleeves) to be worn over their whites at the time of their consecration.” The “whites” are explained, in a previous clause, to be a “Rochett and sleeves.” This passage seems to imply that the chimere was already worn (as in 1662) during part at least of the consecration service. Such a usage would not, however, in itself determine the dress of a Bishop as a “Minister.” The *Order* e.g. prescribes the Rochett and sleeves for Bishops ministering in ordinary Churches, and “capes” (= copes) “in our Chapel Royal or any

cathedral church within that our kingdom," not only for Bishops but for other ministers.

Nevertheless, seeing that the cope was, as we shall presently observe, given up by Archbishop Parker in some, at least, of the acts of consecration done by him in 1570-1575 (see §4), that is in the last years of his archiepiscopate, and that he simply wore a "surplice," it is unlikely that his successors were more scrupulous as to vesture. By the word "surplice" we are probably to understand a rochet,² but there is no mention in the registers, or in the documents that mention the disuse of the cope, which will be quoted in the next section, of any substitution of the chimere for the cope as a super-vestment at holy communion. Such a substitution began early in preaching,³ and the chimere and rochet were worn by Parker and two other bishops at a short service attended by Queen Elizabeth when she visited Canterbury in 1573 (Nichols' *Progresses of Queen Elizabeth*, i. 345), and apparently by Archbishop Sandys at his visitation at York in 1577, at which he is described in his Register as "vestibus pontificalibus indutus." Perhaps the earliest effigy of a bishop vested in rochet, chimere, and tippet, but without any kind of cope or mantle, is that of Bishop Guest, † 1577, at Salisbury. See Appendix B. Further, in the time of Bancroft, who presided as Bishop of London at the Convocation which passed the Canons of 1604, and in Canon 24 directed again the use of the cope in cathedral and collegiate churches, it is likely that greater care would be observed in consecrating bishops outside such churches. It may be to him, or at least to the bishops of the first years of King James I., that we owe the introduction of the chimere as a vestment of a bishop's "ministration." This, at any rate, is suggested by an entry in Bancroft's Register, fol. 22, of an act of consecration at London House, performed by his successor, Richard Vaughan (10th Feb., 1605), in which the latter is described as "vestibus episcopalibus indutus." There is a remarkable figure of an ordination on Bishop Robinson of Carlisle's curious little brass, † 1616, which bears out this view. See Appendix B.

We have, however, found no similar entry in the Lambeth Registers until that of the second consecration in Archbishop Sheldon's Register, fol. 18, 24 Aug. 1667, in which it is recorded

² See the reference to the "episcopal surplice" in Parker's Register quoted above, and *Some blemishes, &c.*, in Zurich Letters P.S. i. 164, in 1566: "The popish habits are ordered to be worn out of church and by ministers in general; and the bishops wear their linen garments which they call a rochet." So also Rev. N. F. Robinson, *The black chimere, &c.*

³ Machyn's *Diary*, p. 226, March 3rd, 1560: "The same day did preach at Paul's Cross the new Bishop of London, Master Grindal, in his rochet and chimere. . . . The same day at afternoon did preach at the court the Bishop Scory in his rochet and chimere." So also pp. 227, 229, 251.

that "Pontificalibus solemniter indutis,⁴ munus consecrationis reverendo viro N., observatis et adhibitis ritibus et ceremoniis de usu moderno Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ in hac parte observandis et adhibendis, juxta modum et formam in libro intitulo *The forme and manner* realiter impendit Ipsumque in Episcopum consecravit insigniisque episcopalibus tunc et ibidem solemniter decoravit." The plain English of this, considering the period of the record, seems to be that both the consecrating and consecrated bishop were vested in rochet and chimere. The consecration was, as usual, in Lambeth Chapel.

§ 3. *Usage in the reigns of Henry VIII. and Edward VI. as illustrated from Cranmer's Registers. Cranmer's blessing of the pallium for York. Hooper's Consecration. Use of other ornaments besides the cope by the consecrating Archbishop up to 1552.*

The Registers of consecrations of bishops at Lambeth include a certain number of notes in regard to the ornaments used which have for the most part not been sufficiently quoted in this debate. The following appear to be worth recording.

As regards the *pallium* it was ordered to be conferred without reference to Rome, by the Act 25 Hen. VIII. c. 20, sec. 4, A.D. 1533-4, which is still on the Statute Book. It was therefore given by Cranmer to George Browne, consecrated Abp. of Dublin at Lambeth 19 March 1536, and to Robert Holgate on his promotion to York in 1544. See Cranmer's Register, fols. 186 and 309-10. His form of blessing the pallium was first published by [Bp.] W. Stubbs in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, v. 209, p. 522, 1860. It has been re-edited by Dr. Legg in his *The Blessing of the Pall, Yorkshire Arch. J.*, vol. xv. p. 124, 1898.

As regards the usual ceremonies at the consecration of Bishops, the entry of the consecration of Thomas Goodrych to Ely, 19 April 1534 (fol. 82), gives the type which belongs to a period before the controversy began. "Reverendissimus pater pontificalibus indutus tunc et ibidem sedens, assidentibus et sibi assistantibus Reverendis confratribus NN. episcopis, impendebat munus consecrationis Reverendo patri domino Thomae Goodrych electo et confirmato Eliensi."

Edward VI. came to the throne 28 Jan. 1547. The consecration of Nicholas Ridley 5 Sept. 1547 took place in the dean's chapel, St. Paul's, by commission to Henry Bishop of Lincoln and others.

⁴ Similar words are found in nearly all Sheldon's Acts of Consecration, but in the later ones (from 11 Feb. 1672, fol. 96) they are attached to the assistant bishops, whose names just precede the words "munus consecrationis." This seems to have been a blunder of the registrar, as the phrase becomes "in pontificalibus solemniter (or judicialiter) sedentibus (or sedentes)" and the like, which call attention to a fact of little importance.

We read: "Reverendus pater . . . insigniis pontificiis indutus et decoratus . . . munus consecrationis more ecclesie Anglicane solitum (*sic*) per sacri crismatis unctionem et manuum suarum impositionem . . . benedixit consecravit et insigniis pontificiis rite insignivit" (f. 321).

The Consecration of Robert Farrar by the old ordinal (9 Sept. 1548, fol. 327) shows the use of the English "Communion order" of that year apparently with the addition of psalms and hymns and an otherwise unknown Eucharistic consecration prayer in English. Cranmer is described as "pontificalibus insigniis indutus." "Idem Menevensis, lectis publice communibus suffragiis de more Ecclesie Anglicane usitatis (= the Litany), consecratus et benedictus per impositionem manuum Episcoporum predictorum fuit. Qua peracta idem Reverendissimus, publice et palam recitatis quibusdam psalmis himnis et orationibus, una cum Epistola Pauli et Evangelio Matthei, consecrata in lingua vernacula sacra Eucharist[i]a. Reverendissimus primus communicavit ipso sacramentum Corporis et Sanguinis, tunc Reverendis patribus . . . et aliis communicavit et distribuit in verbis anglicis."

Since much has been written as to Hooper's Consecration (8 March, 1551, fol. 332) the account given of it in Cranmer's Register may be quoted rather than the earlier record as to Poynet (29 June 1550, fol. 330), with which it is in verbal agreement. Both are full and careful records, and both describe the use of the new prayer-book and ordinal (*liber ordinarius*). "Idem Reverendissimus ad hoc tam sacrum munus obeundum usitatis insigniis redimitus et uno epitogio sive capa holoserica indutus, Oratorium suum predictum honeste et decenter ornatum ingressus, ad celebrandum sacrosanctam Domini Cenam uti moris ex prescripto libri intitulati *the booke of comen Service* est coram plebe ibidem congregata accinctus, inchoatis primitus et publice recitatis sanctis suffragiis in hac parte deputatis (*i.e.* the Litany), lectis in vulgari Epistola et Evangelio in hunc diem designatis: eisque finitis Reverendi patres N N. superpelliciis lintheis et capis induti, Baculos suos pastores in eorum manibus tenentes, dictum dominum Johannem Hoper, consimile habitu indutum, medium inter se ducentes, eum eidem Reverendissimo patri . . . presentabant et exhibebant . . . Quibus sic in ordine expeditis Reverendissimus habuit verba ad populum et plebem, hortando et exortando omnem cetum presentem ad supplicationes fundendas iuxta contextum et ordinem prescriptum in libro ordinario emanato sub datum mensis Marci anno Domini 1549. Pro cuius libri serie et tenore superdictus electus fuit rite et recte consecratus et episcopalibus insigniis imbutus."

The consecration of John Ponet or Poynet is recorded in practically the same words, and so are those of Coverdale and Scory (30 August 1551, fol. 333 and 334), at all of which Cranmer is

described as “*usitatis insigniis redimitus et uno epitogio sive capa holoserica indutus.*” The antithesis between “*redimitus*” and “*indutus*” (which is discussed below in § 5 with reference to the mitre) certainly implies the presence of some ornaments, proper to a Bishop, besides the cope. Strype, who quotes the words, in describing the consecration of Ponet (*Cranmer*, p. 253), paraphrases them: “Having on his mitre and cope, usual in such cases, went into his chapel,” &c. He may be right in interpreting the “*insignia*” as including the mitre; but the cope is mentioned, apparently, because it was *not* usual in such cases.

The consecration of John Tailor (24 June, 1552) and John Harley (26 May, 1553) are the last recorded as performed by Cranmer (Reg. fol. 335). The records are short and suggest a change of usage: “*consecravit Reverendum patrem N. in episcopum et pastorem ecclesie cathedralis N. adhibitis ceremoniis consuetis et prestitis iuramentis requisitis pro more ecclesie Anglicane iuxta librum in hac parte editum.*”

To judge by these records the consecrating archbishop or bishop, between 1549 and 1552, wore the cope and certain other ornaments, and the assistant bishops wore copes and surplices and carried pastoral staves, and the consecrated bishops received the staff according to the ordinal of 1549.

§ 4. *Elizabethan and later usage fell short of the letter of the law, and cannot furnish a consistent interpretation of it, but it did not go beyond the use of rochet (episcopal surplice), cope and chimere, and perhaps pastoral staff (at consecrations). Evidence from Parker's and later Registers. Precedent of his own consecration. He adopts the surplice alone in consecrating Curteis at Canterbury (1570). Disuse of the cope and staff. What is meant by episcopal insignia? Evidence from York Registers adds nothing to our knowledge. Legal position of the pastoral staff.*

As regards the dress of a Bishop engaged in ministration, in the reign of Elizabeth and later, we have a considerable amount of historical information from which it is impossible to extract the conclusion that any certain rule was followed. Puritan feeling both within and outside the Church led to much independent action. The attempt was made with some success to keep up the use of the Cope at the celebration of holy communion, both for Bishops and other ministers, at least in cathedral and collegiate churches (as in the *Advertisements* of 1566, whatever their authority), and with greater success that of the surplice. The pastoral staff, though clearly legal, soon went out of use, except possibly at consecration of Bishops.

Evidence from Parker's Registers. His own consecration a precedent.

As regards Parker's own consecration two things are clear; that it was intended (1) to follow generally the rubrics of 1549-1550, and (2) to make it a precedent for other cases; but even on this occasion there was a combination of formality and informality, and a variety of usage, which has been characteristic of the Church of England ever since. In Parker's own book *De Antiquitate Britannicæ Ecclesiæ*, &c., emphasis is laid on the absence of "the more than Aaronic ornaments, gloves, rings, sandals, buskins, mitre, pall, and other trifles" (ed. Drake, p. 539, 1729). The pastoral staff is not here mentioned; but it is expressly noticed in the Register (Haddan's *Bramhall*, l.c. p. 205) that no pastoral staff was put into the Archbishop's hands. He may possibly have thought that the delivery of it to him by one of his suffragans was unsuitable to his position. In 1549 it is prescribed as an act to be done by the Archbishop to a Bishop. As regards the dress of the consecrating Bishops and other officiating clergy, we are told that Bishop Barlow (who took the lead and was celebrant) and the two chaplains, Archdeacons Bullingham and Geste, wore silk copes. It is implied that these three wore this dress as celebrant and assistants at Holy Communion. Bishops Scory and Hodgskin wore linen surplices, but Coverdale, who had at the time no see and had retired from episcopal duties, only wore a *toga talaris* or cassock. Parker himself at this point wore a linen surplice (Haddan's *Bramhall*, iii. p. 204).

Not only does the *Historiola of the Foundation and Condition of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge*, written about 1569, state that Parker used "the very same solempnitie and manner of consecration toward his bretherne bishoppes upon whom afterward he laide his hande," but a study of the Consecrations recorded in his Registers shows that, for the next ten years, the details of his own Consecration were expressly followed. At Grindall's Consecration, 21 December, 1559, the Archbishop and his two chaplains wore copes, and the Assistant Bishops surplices; and the record further runs: "munus consecrationis Reverendo patri domino Edmundo Grindall, sacre Theologie Bacchalaureo, in episcopum et pastorem ecclesie cathedralis divi Pauli Londonensis electo et confirmato, Ceremoniis et Ritibus, in Actis Consecrationis dicti Reverendissimi patris expressis, adhibitis impendebat, et eum episcopalibus insigniis decoravit." Similar words "iuxta morem et formam circa consecrationem ipsius Reverendissimi patris . . . in capella sua predicta usitata," are found in the records of the Consecrations of 21 January, 24 March, and 14 July, 1560. Then from 1 September, 1560 onwards, with one exception, we have such words as

"adhibitis ceremoniis de usu moderno ecclesie Anglicane adhibendis," viz.: 16 February, and 26 May, 1561, 19 April, 1562, 5 May, and 20 October, 1566, and 15 May, 1569 (adhibitis ceremoniis consuetis . . . consecravit et episcopalibus insigniis decoravit). These were all held at Lambeth Chapel except one at Croydon (26 May, 1561).

Change at the Consecration of Curteis (1570).

It is therefore remarkable that on 21 May, 1570, a different use was followed at the Consecration of Richard Curteis to Chichester, in Canterbury Cathedral, in which the Archbishop, as well as the assistant Bishops Edmund (Grindal), now elect of York, Robert (Horne) of Winton, and Edmund (Geste) of Rochester, was vested in a linen surplice (superpellicio linteo indutus ad sacram communionem celebrandam perexit (*sic*), reliqui vero episcopi prenominati ad scamna predicta, superpelliciiis linteis similiter induti, genua flexerunt), and nothing is said as to the dress of the Bishop elect. The form of the document is in several respects peculiar. Four more Consecrations were held in Lambeth Chapel—18 March, 1571, 9 March, 1572, 13 December, 1573, 17 April, 1575—at two of which, those of Edmund Freake to Rochester, and William Hughes to Llandaff (1572 and 1573) it is stated that the Archbishop was vested in a white surplice. The other two cases have no special reference to the dress of the Archbishop, but employ the words as to the modern or present use of the Church of England, which are found in all the Lambeth Consecrations from September, 1560, onwards.

The information which we at present possess does not wholly account for this change of policy in the disuse of the cope on so solemn an occasion as the Consecration of Curteis, who had been chaplain to the Archbishop, and was now chaplain to the Queen, on Trinity Sunday, 1570, in the Metropolitan church of Canterbury. In 1564 the Vice-Dean of that church certified that the cope was worn by the priest, the epistler, and gospeller at the monthly communion. The Archbishop himself, as lately as 1566, had insisted on the use of the cope in cathedral churches in the *Advertisements*. The occasion itself was one of peculiar solemnity, since Grindal was present in Canterbury for his confirmation as Archbishop of York, and took part in the consecration of Curteis and was entertained that Sunday afternoon by Parker at a noble feast—which is referred to in the Register. Grindal himself had said in 1567: "You see me wear a cope or a surplice in Paul's" (*Remains*, p. 211); but he added: "I had rather minister without these things, but for order's sake and

obedience to the prince.”⁵ The *Advertisements* had been violently resisted by the Puritans, especially that which required the surplice; and many of the clergy (particularly in London) were deprived in consequence. Parker did not receive that support from the lay members of the Court of High Commission, or from all his brother Bishops, which he naturally expected. He may have thought that by throwing over the cope in cathedrals he could do something to satisfy his critics and opponents. The excommunication of the Queen by Pope Pius V. dated 25 Feb., 1570, had also shattered the hopes of the moderate party as to the possibility of retaining the Romanists within the Church of England, and there was therefore less need to study the inclinations of the latter. Some instances of the disuse of the cope about this date have already been given in the previous chapter, section 4. The Puritan *Admonition to the Parliament* of 1572, speaking of ordination, wrote: “now ther is required an albe [ed. 2 om.], a surplesse, a vestiment, a pastoral staffe” (p. 10 ed. C.H.S. 1907). Whitgift’s reply says nothing directly of the cope, which the Puritans must have included in the term “vestment,” but it bears on the question as to the sort of policy then pursued: “In the book now allowed of making deacons and ministers and consecrating of bishops, there is neither required alb, surplice, vestment, nor pastoral staff. Read the book from beginning to the ending. And therefore this is a false and untrue report.” (*Works*, p. 49.) As this reply was submitted to Parker (Strype’s *Whitgift*, p. 42) we may almost consider it an official withdrawal of the principle of requiring anything but the rochet in a Bishop. However this may be, if Parker, who was at first so careful to set and follow a precedent in this matter, gave up the cope on so striking an occasion as the consecration of Curteis, it is not likely that his successors and brother Bishops would be more scrupulous. In 1590, in the time of Whitgift (1583-1604), *A Petition to her Majesty* in speaking of the *Consecration of Bishops*, says: “They retain the surplice, seldom the cope, but they never use their

⁵ This was in the examination of certain Londoners before the High Commission. A similar policy might possibly seem to be indicated in the *Liber quorundam canonum* of 1571, in which Deans, Archdeacons, Residentiaries, &c., are directed to cease from wearing the gray almuce, and only to wear in their churches that linen vesture which still is retained by Royal command and the scholastic epomis (hood) of their degree. (*Cf.* Canon 25 of 1604.) But this direction probably refers only to their vesture in choir, since the *Admonition to Parliament* in 1572 writes expressly (Art. 2, p. 35): “For the order of administration of Sacraments and common prayer, enough is said before, al the service and administration is tyed to a surplesse, in Cathedrall churches they must have a cope”; and below: “We marvel that they could espy in their last Synode, that a gray Amise which is but a garment of dignitie, should be a garment (as they say) defyled with superstition, and yet that copes, caps, surplesses, tippetts and such lyke baggage . . . should be retayned styll, and not abolyshed.”

pastoral staves" (quoted by Tomlinson, *The Prayer-book, Articles and Homilies*, p. 135).⁶

What is meant by the word "insignia"?

Besides the dress and action of the consecrator and his assistants described in the records of episcopal consecrations there is a phrase used about Grindal's consecration (1559), in the record already quoted, which requires some comment. It runs "munus consecrationis impendebat et eum episcopalibus insigniis decoravit." Similar words are found also in the record of the consecration of Thomas Davies to S. Asaph, 26 May, 1561, at Croydon (munus consecrationis adhibitis de ritu et more ecclesie anglicane insigniis et ceremoniis adhibendis impendebat; Ipsumque episcopalibus insigniis decoravit"), and in a simpler form of Ri. Cheyney, Gloucester, 19 Ap. 1562; Hugh Jones, Llandaff, 5 May, 1566; Nicholas Robinson, Bangor, 20 Oct., 1566; Ri. Rogers, Suffragan of Dover, 15 May, 1569; and Wm. Blethin, Llandaff, 17 April, 1575. The words are not usually found in entries of later Archbishops; but they occur in Whitgift's Consecration of John Sterne, Suffragan of Colchester, 12 Nov. 1592, where they may possibly be copied by the registrar, without any special purpose or meaning, from the parallel case of another Suffragan, Ri. Rogers, of Dover. The return to their use under Sheldon has been already noticed. In Parker's Consecrations they may perhaps refer to the tradition of the pastoral staff ordered in 1550; but they probably at least include the vesting in the rochet and chimere after the Consecration. In pre-reformation Consecrations a pastoral staff of painted wood⁷—i.e. one merely symbolical—was used, and a copper ring with counterfeit stone, so that the absence of the use of the staff in ministration would not necessarily prove that it was not used in the act of Consecration.

In Grindal's Registers, as Archbishop of Canterbury, there is no reference to dress, but the general form is "munus consecrationis adhibitis ritibus et ceremoniis de usu moderno ecclesie anglicane adhibendis, juxta formam descriptam in libro intitulado. *The fourme and manner of makinge and consecratinge Bishoppes Preests and Deacons*, impendebat."

⁶ Similarly in *Certain motions whereupon a Conference is humbly desired between the Lords of the Higher House and a Committee of the Lower House* (Petyt MSS. in the Inner Temple, quoted by Tomlinson, p. 132, without date) we read: "By what authority the Bishops omit the use of Copes and the bearing of their pastoral staff, which the book of the Q[ueen] and 3 Edw. VI. prescribeth, whereunto the plat of the primo [*sc. Elizabethae*] referreth for rites as well as the minister for ornaments." The word "plat" seems to mean here "scheme," "design."

⁷ See Canon Chr. Wordsworth, *The Precedence of English Bishops*, p. 23, 1906, from Lambeth MS., 751.

This form, with slight modification, became permanent and has been practically in use ever since, with the exception (as far has been observed) of the London House consecration of 1605, and the more remarkable records in Sheldon's time already mentioned. Sancroft added the word "circumstantiis" before "ritibus et ceremoniis," and ended the sentence with words borrowed from Sheldon's formula, "realiter impendit (impendebat) ipsumque in episcopum consecravit." English first appears in Potter's Registers. The general form now established among us would thus seem to be that of Grindal's Register, as finally amended by Sancroft, translated into English.

The following Consecrations in the York Registers have been kindly examined for us by a correspondent: Ri. Barnes, Nottingham (suff.), 9 March, 1567; John May, Carlisle, 29 Sep. 1577; Wm. Chaderton, Chester, 8 Nov. 1579; Matthew Hutton, Durham, 27 July, 1589; Ri. Senhouse, Carlisle, 26 Sept. 1624; and Fras. White, Carlisle, 3 Dec. 1626.

The earliest of these (Barnes) falls in Archbishop Young's time, and much the same words are used as in Grindal's records at Lambeth. The same formula is adopted for May, Senhouse, and White. In the cases of Chaderton and Hutton the formula is like that in Parker's Register: "ipsumque in episcopum consecravit, insigniisque episcopalibus tum et ibidem solemniter decoravit."

The York Registers therefore add nothing to our knowledge.

Legal position of the pastoral staff.

Whatever may be the meaning of the phrase "episcopalibus insigniis decoravit" in the Registers, there can, we think, be no doubt that a pastoral staff or crosier is a legal ornament of a Bishop in the Church of England, as we have already stated in § 1. It fell indeed rapidly into general disuse, as we have already indicated in dealing with the cope; but it was never, in any sense, abolished, and it has been revived (with general approval or acquiescence) in the generation immediately preceding our own. Two of the earliest to come into use, if not the earliest, were those given by Mr. Hubbard, from the collection of the Rev. W. Sewell at Radley College, to Bishops S. Wilberforce, of Winchester, and W. K. Hamilton, of Salisbury. The latter was first used, at a meeting of Archdeacons, Rural Deans, and Diocesan Inspectors in 1863. The only extant seventeenth-century staff certainly designed for actual use is that of Bishop Wren (1631-1638), which is preserved, with his mitre, at Pembroke College, Cambridge. It is thus described in Foster and Atkinson, *Old Cambridge Plate*, p. 96, 1896: "No. 177 CROZIER. Parcel gilt. Pembroke College. The head is formed of rococo

foliage and is silver gilt: the staff which is in two separate pieces is of silver and has an iron spike at the foot. Dimensions: Total length 5 ft. 10 $\frac{1}{4}$ in., length of head 6 $\frac{1}{2}$, diameter of staff, $\frac{4}{5}$."

The one which was found in an attic at St. John's College, Oxford, in the time of President Wynter, and which is now preserved in a glass case in the library, may *possibly* have belonged to Archbishop Laud (*cp.* W. H. Hutton, *William Laud*, p. 231, 1896). It is very carefully made and well and somewhat floridly carved in smooth brown wood, perhaps English cedar, with metal bands and ornaments. It is about 6 ft. 3 in. high, and has a well-finished iron ferule and point. It seems almost too good to have been a merely funeral ornament used, as some suppose, at the elaborate obsequies of Archbishop Juxon. Another suggestion is that it belonged to the non-juring Bishop Richard Rawlinson (1728-1755). It seems to deserve more careful scrutiny than it has as yet received. The mitre and pastoral staff which were probably borne at the funeral of Bishop Peter Mews, † 1706, are preserved in Winchester Cathedral on the north wall of the Guardian Angels' Chapel. The mitre is said to be of embossed tin (? iron), 15 in. high, and still retains traces of gilding. The staff is of light wood and was originally painted. The head is carved with a flowing leaf pattern and is 12 in. high and 8 in. across. The stem is 4 ft. 8 in. in length and is pointed at the end. Similar ornaments hang on the pillar above the grave of Bishop George Morley, † 1684, also at Winchester. The staff of another Bishop of the same see, Sir Jonathan Trelawney, made of painted deal (with metal top), eight feet long, is fastened to the east wall of the Trelawney aisle in Pelynt Church, Cornwall, having been removed from the family vault. Like the other two it was apparently only an undertaker's ornament.

Besides the numerous pastoral staves which appear on the effigies of Bishops described in the Appendix, we may mention the curious alabaster effigy of Walter de Merton, † 1277, in Rochester Cathedral, erected in 1598 at the instance of the Warden of Merton College, Sir H. Saville. It represents the Bishop partly in the dress of the sixteenth century, and with a staff the head or crook of which resembles the modern shepherd's crook.

§ 5. *The legal position of the mitre. Disused by Cranmer at St. Paul's in 1549. It may have been used by him in consecrating Bishops up to 1552. Meaning of "redimitus." Later traces.*

The legal position of the mitre is somewhat obscure. It was natural, considering the character of the previous reigns, that it should be worn at the Coronations of King Edward VI. by Cranmer

(1546), and of Queen Elizabeth, by Oglethorp Bishop of Carlisle (15 January, 1559), as is recorded by Strype (*Cranmer*, p. 142, and *Annals* i. p. 30). But it is expressly stated that Cranmer did not wear a mitre when he celebrated at St. Paul's 21st July, 1549. We read in the *Greyfriars' Chronicle*, in *Mon. Franciscana*, ii. p. 221: "So the Bishop of Canterbury was there at procession, and did the office himself in a cope and no vestment, nor mitre, nor crosse, but a crose staffe, and so did all the office, and his satten cap on his head all the time of the office; and so gave the communion himself to eight persons of the said church." But as regards consecrations in his own chapel at Lambeth, to judge from the language of the *Register*, it is not unlikely that he may have continued the use of ornaments other than those which he wore on more public occasions. At the Consecration of Ridley, 25th September 1547, he is described in his *Register*, fol. 321, as "insignibus pontificiis indutus et decoratus," and at that of Ferrar, 30th March, 1548 (pontificalibus insigniis indutus, *Reg.*, f. 327B). Further, after the publication of the new Prayer Book and Ordinal, at the Consecrations of Poynt, 29th June, 1550, Hooper, 8th March, 1551, Coverdale and Scory, 30th August, 1551, he is described in the same record as "usitatis insigniis redimitus et uno epitogio sive capa holoserica indutus" (*Reg.* ff. 330B, 332, 333, 334B). The word "redimitus" has a technical sense, in opposition to "indutus," and refers properly to the secondary and more ornamental insignia with which a Bishop was arrayed, including sandals, dalmatic, mitre, gloves, ring, and staff.⁸ Clearly something more than the cope is intended by the phrase in Cranmer's *Register*. It would, of course, cover the use of the staff which we learn from the *Greyfriars' Chronicle* he used at St. Paul's in 1549, but that could hardly exhaust the meaning of the word "insignia." Strype's inference, therefore, may be correct that Cranmer, at these consecrations, also wore the mitre. The records of the two next Consecrations, the last in his own Register, of Taylor, 26th June, 1552, and Harley, 26th May, 1553, are much more concise, and may cover a change of ritual. All that is said is "adhibitis ceremoniis consuetis" (*Reg.* fol. 335). From that time onwards it would seem difficult to prove that an Anglican prelate had worn a mitre, except at the coronation of Queen Elizabeth, which is really no exception, until comparatively recent times. Pilkington, Bishop of Durham, acknowledges that

⁸ The distinction between "indui" and "redimiri" is drawn by Honorius of Autun, c. 1125, in his *Gemma Animae*, i. 209 (Marriott, p. 137, Hittorp, p. 1223, ed. Paris, 1624): "Episcopus eisdem septem vestibus induitur (i.e. as the priest), et aliis septem redimitur, scilicet Sandaliis, Dalmatica, Rationali, Mitra, Chirothecis, Annulo, Baculo." It is noticeable that the tunicle is not mentioned amongst episcopal vestments, and this agrees with its absence from our early effigies. It is mentioned by Innocent III., *De s. a. m.*, i. 55.

he and the bishops of his day had neither "cruce nor mitre." (In 1561, *Works* P.S. pp. 584, 586).

On the other hand the use of mitres was popularly attributed to Laud and other Bishops of Charles I.'s reign, as in the Puritan *Lambeth Fair*, the *Rump Songs*, and in Lord Brooke's *Discourse opening the nature of that Episcopacy which is exercised in England* (*Hierurgia Angl.* ii. 242, 243, 240).

The instance of such use which seems most plausibly urged is in connexion with the mitre of Bishop Wren of Ely, preserved with his staff at Pembroke College, Cambridge. In *Hierurgia Anglicana*, ed. 2, iii. p. xvii. 1902, in a description of the plate facing p. 335, we read: "The mitre is of English workmanship, silver gilt, with repoussé decorations; it is fitted with a cap of crimson satin lined with white silk, the state of this lining showing that the mitre has been actually worn. Its height is $11\frac{1}{2}$ inches, and its diameter is $7\frac{1}{2}$ inches. The mitre is described in Green's *Short History of the English People*, vol. iii. p. 1326. Wren died A.D. 1667." It is also figured in Cox and Harvey's *English Church Furniture*, p. 56, 1907. In *Hierurgia*, ii. 310, are quotations asserting that a mitre was carried by the Bishop of Rochester at the Investiture of Knights of the Bath in July, 1725, and by the Archbishops and Bishops in the procession to Westminster at the coronation of George II., 11th October, 1727. An Archbishop of Cashel is said to have worn one at a funeral in 1781, and Bishop Seabury, in the United States, in 1785 (*Hierurgia*, pp. 234-5).

We may add that there has been a practically continuous tradition that the mitre is an episcopal ornament, and that on three lines: (1) heraldic usage; (2) its presence on the head of effigies of Bishops in stone and brass, of which a number are extant, of the sixteenth, seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries; and (3) its presence in funeral processions, where an actual mitre or the figure of one was sometimes carried, and sometimes suspended over the tomb. Illustrations of traditions (2) and (3) will be found in the volume last quoted. The most remarkable of the effigies catalogued in Appendix B is the brass of Samuel Harsnett, Archbishop of York, who died in 1631, which is in Chigwell Church, Essex. He is vested in mitre, cope, surplice, rochet, and gloves, with pastoral staff (*Hierurgia*, iii. p. xvi. and plate opposite p. 229; Green's *History*, iii. p. 1056, &c.). There is another, and that a stone effigy, of Bishop John Hacket, † 1670, in Lichfield Cathedral, vested in mitre and open chimere, with pastoral staff; and another of Bishop Robert Creighton (1670-2) in Wells Cathedral, in which he is vested in mitre, cope, and alb, with pastoral staff. Later effigies of prelates wearing mitres are Archbishops Sheldon, † 1677, Sterne, † 1683, Dolben, † 1686, Lamplugh, † 1691, and Sharp, † 1714; and Bishops Brideoake, † 1678,

Gunning, † 1684, and Seth Ward, † 1689, and more recently Graham, † 1865, Lonsdale, † 1867, Hamilton, † 1869, Wilberforce, † 1873, Wordsworth and Woodford, † 1885, Harold Browne, † 1891, Durnford, † 1895, and Creighton, † 1901. But these effigies are, we believe, all unhistorical in this point, except the last.

The pallium similarly retained its place among the heraldic ornaments of our Archbishops of Canterbury, though it has latterly been unusual in those of the Archbishops of York. Archbishop Waldby was apparently the first to use the modern arms on his seal (1397-8), viz. gules two keys in saltire argent and in chief the cap or tiara of St. Peter (see above, p. 24—this is often wrongly described as a “royal crown”). The seal of Archbishop Lee (1531-44) is said to be the latest on which the pallium is found (Woodward, *Eccl. Heraldry*, p. 190-1, Edinb. 1894; cp. W. K. R. Bedford, *Blazon of Episcopacy*, ed. 2, p. 134, Oxf. 1897). But the curious effigy of Archbishop Williams at Llandegai (pp. 23 and 115) clearly shows it, and probably other instances could be found. Indeed the present Archbishop has to some extent revived the heraldic use of the pallium. Certainly, as we have seen, Cranmer intended the use of the pallium to continue at York. The arms assigned by heralds to the Archbishops of Armagh and Dublin show the cross-staff and the pallium charged in the first case with four, and in the second with five, crosses.

CONCLUSION.

In concluding this lengthy Report we need say nothing further as to “the Ornaments of the Church” on which our opinion is sufficiently expressed in Chapter II., Section III., pp. 56-64.

As regards “the Ornaments of the Minister” we believe that the evidence here collected indicates that they cannot rightly be regarded as expressive of doctrine, but that their use is a matter of reverent and seemly order. All questions of legislation, therefore, in regard to them are questions of expediency rather than of principle. What should be the action of the Church at the present time in extending or restricting liberty as regards such Ornaments, or in making definite requirements as to their use, or in leaving the controversy about them where it stands, lies outside the reference of our Sub-Committee.

Signed on behalf of the Sub-Committee,

JOHN SARUM,

Convener.

23 January, 1908.

APPENDIX A.

ON THE MEANING OF THE TERM "VESTMENT."

It is commonly assumed that the term "vestment" in the Ornaments Rubric of 1549, so frequently referred to in the Report, means a chasuble with its appurtenances, *i.e.* with amice, stole, and maniple or fanon; but this seems uncertain. The word "vestment" is variously used, and sometimes it is used comprehensively for a whole set or suit, including much more than the chasuble, amice, stole, and fanon, *e.g.* in a constitution of Archbishop Gray of York (1250) we read, "Vestimentum ipsius ecclesiae principale, videlicet casula, alba munda, amictus, stola, manipulus, zona, cum tribus tuellis; corporalia et alia vestimenta pro diacono honesta, juxta facultates parochianorum et ecclesiae, cum cappa serica principali, pro principalibus festis; et cum duabus aliis, pro choris regendis in festis supradictis." It may be doubtful how far the "videlicet" in this passage extends, but at any rate the alb is included under the term, and possibly the whole set of "ornaments." Again, in a constitution of Archbishop Winchelsea (1350) we have, "Vestimentum principale cum casula, dalmatica, tunica, et cum cappa in choro cum omnibus suis appendiciis, frontale ad magnum altare cum tribus tuellis, tria superpellicia, unum rochetum, &c.," where again it may be doubtful how much the word is intended to cover. On this passage the gloss in Lyndwood should be noted: "Appendiciis sc. amictibus, albis Cingulis, manipulis, et stolis" (*Prov.* p. 250), where "albis Cingulis" should probably be "albis, cingulis," as the alb is not elsewhere mentioned (*cf.* Bonner's Articles given below). In Bonner's Articles of Visitation (1554) we have "a principal vestment with chasuble, a vestment for the deacon and subdeacon, a cope with the appurtenances, it is to wit, an amice, albe, girdle, stole, and fanon, the high altar with apparel in the front and other parts thereof, three towels, three surplices, a rochet, &c.," where he seems generally to be following Winchelsea with the gloss in Lyndwood (*Cardwell, Doc. Annals*, i. p. 151). Other instances, given in *Essays on Ceremonial*, De la More press, 1904, p. 246, are these:

"Item a red vestment, embroidered with lions of gold, of red satin; that is to say, a chasuble and a tunicle to the same, with two albs, two amices, two stoles, two fanons, and two girdles

lately mended, and a cope thereto powdered with lions." (St. Mary-at-Hill, London, 1486.)

"Item, unum vestimentum rubeum de velveto, texto cum imaginibus pondratis cum perlis: viz. cum una casula, duabus tunicis, tribus albis, tribus amictibus, cum stolis et fanonibus pertinentibus eidem, cum una bona capa ejusdem secta (?) et duabus aliis capis quasi ejusdem operis sed sine perlis, cum altari de eadem secta, et ridellio de sindone rubea." (St. George's College, Windsor, 8 Ric. II.)

This comprehensive use of the word is well established; but it cannot be the use in the Rubric, because the alb is mentioned separately, and the cope is given as an alternative for the "vestment." If then the term includes anything more than the chasuble it can only be the amice, stole, and fanon: and it is asserted that this meaning of the term is very common, as well as a use including the *alb* in addition. The word is certainly sometime loosely used, and may perhaps in some cases stand for the chasuble with the amice, stole, and fanon, the alb being mentioned separately. Very many of the instances, however, commonly cited for this (as *e.g.*, those in *Essays on Ceremonial*, p. 246), are quite inconclusive, as "vestment" is often a convertible term with "chasuble"; and it does not seem to be at all conclusively established that "vestment" with "alb" mentioned separately, and "cope" given as an alternative, in a document with the precision and directive force of a Rubric, means more than the actual chasuble.

APPENDIX B.

CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF EFFIGIES OF ANGLICAN
BISHOPS FROM A.D. 1547 TO 1907.

NOTE.—The following list of effigies is probably incomplete, but it is fuller than any other at present in existence. The effigies cannot be considered as by any means conclusive evidence as to the vestments worn by all the Bishops represented. Probably a certain unreality in such matters has been a tradition for a very long period, as we have seen is the case in the Benedictional of Aethelwold. Even in our own days a certain number of eminent Bishops have been represented on their monuments as wearing mitres, while they never did so in life. But a careful consideration of these effigies will nevertheless convey a good deal of historical information. The majority of the earlier effigies here catalogued have been described by M. H. Bloxam, *Essays on Church Vestments*, &c., ed. 1882, but many of his descriptions have been verified and corrected by personal inspection either on our own part or that of friends. We owe very hearty thanks to the dignitaries and officers of our Cathedral Churches, and to the special students of antiquity, especially Mr. W. H. St. John Hope, who have helped us by their correspondence to make this list as complete as it is. In our descriptions the place of burial is the Cathedral Church of the Bishop's see, unless another place is mentioned after the date of death. R.E. = recumbent effigy. We shall esteem it a favour if those who have knowledge or opportunity will send us any additions to, or corrections of, our text.

1. THOMAS GOODRICH, Ely, † 4 May, 1554. Brass, Boutell *Mon. Brasses*, Bloxam, p. 277. Mitre; chasuble, maniple, dalmatic, stole, tunicle, alb, amice, tasselled gloves; r.h. holds book, great seal hangs from thumb, l.h. holds staff.
2. JOHN HARMAN, OR VOYSEY, OR VEASEY, Exeter (1519-51, 1553-4), † 1555, at Sutton Coldfield, near Birmingham (where he gave the well-known Park to public use). R.E., fig. Bloxam, p. 38. Mitre; chasuble, maniple, tunicle, alb, amice; tasselled gloves, with ring on each hand; staff.

3. JOHN BELL, Worcester (res. 1543), † 1556, St. James, Clerkenwell. Brass. Mitre, chasuble, maniple, dalmatic, alb, amice, gloves. No stole or tunicle visible. R.h. raised in blessing, ring on middle finger; l.h. holds staff, ring on fore-finger. Rubbing sent by Rev. W. E. Lupton. See J. P. Malcolm *Londinium Redivivum*, iii. 212 (plate), 1803, and H. M. Macklin, *The Brasses of England*, pp. 112, 115, 1907.

4. ROBERT WARTON OR PUREFOY, Hereford, † 1557.* From personal inspection. R.E., mutilated, a mass of stone, without head, arms, or feet, with remains of chasuble.

* There is a figure in stained glass in Christ Church, Oxford, of Robert King, first Bishop, † 1557, over his destroyed brass, in which he is represented with mitre; cope, ungirdled alb or rochet, amice, tasselled gloves; staff. It was engraved by Wm. Fowler in 1808.

5. PAUL BUSH, Bristol, † 2 Oct., 1558. A cadaver. The head with tonsure is resting on his mitre, and a broken staff lies at his side. The epitaph, after recording his name, &c., begins in verse:

Dignus qui primam circum sua tempora mitram.
Indueret, iacet hic Bristolense decus.

and ends, after a play upon both his names:

Ut madidos arbusta iuant, sic foedere rupto
Inter discordes pacificator erat.

6. [JOHN WHITE, Winchester, † 1560. Macklin's *Brasses of England*, p. 238, &c. No monument is erected to him in the Cathedral Church where he lies buried, but he prepared his own brass in the College Chapel, with a long inscription, during his Wardenship. On this he is represented in a cope. This must have been executed before 1554. He was always an adherent of the old religion.]

7. JOHN PARKHURST, Norwich, † 1574. Brass now destroyed. See Sir T. Browne's *Repertorium*, ed. 1712, p. 3, and Blomefield's *Norfolk*, ii. p. 395. "The fair monument of marble on which was his Proportion engraven on Brass, with a Gown and square Cap on, holding his hands together in a praying Posture . . . was taken away in the Civil War."

8. NICHOLAS BULLINGHAM, Worcester, † 1576. R.E., Bloxam, p. 291, and personal inspection. Fine *pileus rotundus* with raised cross-seams and ear-flaps, ruff; doctor's gown (?) and cassock; Bible in hands.

9. EDMUND GUEST, Sarum, † 1577. Brass erected by his executor Giles Estcourte (probably 1578, see inscription). Kite's *Wiltshire Brasses*, pl. xxiii., Druitt's *Costume on Brasses*, p. 113, 1906, and personal inspection. Scull-cap; chimere,

- rochet buttoned at neck, cassock, tippet; r.h. grasps ornamented hilt of a pommelled walking-staff (about 3 feet 6 inches long, with pointed foot), l.h. holds clasped book.
10. ROBERT PURSGLOVE, Hull (resigned 1559), † 1579, Tideswell. Brass; J. C. Cox, *Churches of Derbyshire*, ii. pl. 14; Bloxam, p. 278. Mitre; chasuble, dalmatic, stole, alb, amice, tasselled and jewelled gloves; staff.
 11. EDMUND GRINDAL, Canterbury, † 1583, Croydon. R.E., fig. Bloxam, p. 278, and J. C. Anderson, *Croydon Church Past and Present*, 1871. Close cap or coif; academic cope with fur hood over rochet; cope closed at bottom, but sufficiently open at top to show hands and sleeves of cassock. Similar copes are seen on the effigies of Bellot † 1596, Still † 1607, and Carey † 1626.
 12. EDWIN SANDYS, York, † 1588, Southwell. R.E., Bloxam, p. 283, *Assoc. Arch. Soc. Rep.*, 10, p. 37 foll. 1869-70; more correctly Mickethwaite, *Archaeol. Journal*, 58, 458, Lond. 1901. Head restored, uncovered (was it destroyed as being mitred?); chasuble with very long train behind, rounded in front, girded alb, cassock, doctor's hood, tippet (?) Bloxam says rochet and chimere instead of cassock and alb.
 13. EDMUND SCAMBLER, Norwich, † 1594. R.E., in alabaster, broken in the time of the Civil War and not now existing. Described in Browne's *Repertorium*, p. 38, cp. Blomefield's *Norfolk*, ii. 403.
 14. HUGH BELLOT, Chester, † 1596, in Wrexham Church. R.E., Bloxam, p. 281, A. N. Palmer, *Hist. of Wrexham Parish Church*, pp. 187-8. Academic cope closed like Grindal's q. v. with fur hood over chimere and rochet. A drawing has been furnished by Rev. F. Sanders, Hoylake Vicarage, Chester. The monument is much worn.
 15. THOMAS BICKLEY, Chichester, † 1596. Small kneeling figure. Bloxam, p. 292. Bare-headed, ruff; black chimere, rochet with white sleeves, black tippet.
 16. HERBERT WESTPHALING, Hereford, † 1601. R.E., lying on right side. Bloxam, p. 293, and personal inspection. Scull-cap, ruff; chimere, rochet and tippet; r.h. to ear; l.h. holds up corners of chimere.
 17. JOHN WHITGIFT, Canterbury, † 29 February, 1604, Croydon. Figured in J. C. Anderson's *Croydon Church*. Cp. Strype's *Whitgift*, p. 580. R.E., "in his gown and tippet, lying along; his hands together in the posture of praying, but now partly broken off . . . much after the model of the monument of his predecessor, Archbishop Grindal; only this appears in scarlet, that of Whitgift in his black

gown." Bloxam, p. 282, says "in a recumbent and devotional attitude, with short hair, a coif or scull-cap on his head, a ruff round his neck and vested with the episcopal habit, the rochet and chimere, with the tippet or black scarf, worn over the latter."

18. GODFREY GOLDSBOROUGH, Gloucester, †1604. R.E., personally inspected. Scull-cap or coif, ruff; chimere, rochet, tippet. The latter is very ample. The sleeves of the rochet are frilled at the cuffs and have a broad band round the wrists. Only a triangle of rochet appears, but the chimere is folded, not mechanically closed.
19. MATTHEW HUTTON, York, †1606. R.E., Bloxam, p. 283. Cap, chimere, and rochet.
20. RICHARD VAUGHAN, London, †1607, in Bangor Cathedral. R.E. much mutilated.
21. JOHN STILL, Bath and Wells, †1607. Painted R.E., Wells. Bloxam, p. 282; plate in Cassan's *Lives of Bishops of Bath and Wells*, 2, p. 20, 1829. Black coif; scarlet academic cope with fur hood and faced with fur, over rochet and chimere.
22. MARTIN HEATON, Ely, †1609. R.E., Bloxam, p. 286. Coif, ruff; embroidered cope (15th century?), rochet, cassock.
23. ANTONY RUDD, St. David's, †1614, in Aberglasny Chapel of Llangathen Church, Golden Grove: erected by his widow 1616. Full-sized R.E. under heavy canopy, remarkable for having his wife (Anna Dalton) by his side, and four children, two (male and female) at each end. Four-cornered cap with ear-flaps, ruff on neck; chimere open at neck to show triangular space of worked and pleated rochet, with flaps of chimere turned back, chimere closed below; tippet over it with heavy folded lower ends; no hood. The hands are crossed, and the fingers of the left or upper hand are broken off, but there is a trace of a ring on the forefinger. In this the effigy is similar to Abbot's †1633, q.v. For closed chimere cp. Bennett, †1617. From information supplied by Rev. J. Alexander Williams, of Llangathen.
24. HENRY ROWLANDS, Bangor, †1616. R.E. much mutilated.
25. HENRY ROBINSON, Carlisle, †1616, Queen's College, Oxford, and Carlisle. Macklin's *Brasses of England*, plate, p. 111. Small brass plate. Scull-cap; chimere, rochet, tippet; pastoral staff surmounted by a crane holding a stone in one claw. On the shaft "Ps. 23. corrigendo sustentando." On the crook encircling an eye "Vigilando, dirigendo." On a short veil "velando." In the background is a representation of Carlisle Cathedral, in the doorway of which three Bishops,

similarly vested, appear to be ordaining a kneeling figure wearing a gown with false sleeves.⁴

26. HENRY PARRY, Worcester, † 1616. R.E., Bloxam, p. 292, and personal inspection, a rude plaster effigy. Scull-cap; chimere and rochet with tippet.
27. ROBERT BENNETT, Hereford, † 1617. R.E., Bloxam, p. 293, and personal inspection. Scull-cap, ruff; closed chimere, showing triangle of rochet about 9 inches deep on breast, long tippet with fur border at bottom. Cp. Rudd, † 1614.
28. JAMES MONTAGUE, Winton, † 1618, Bath Abbey. R.E., Bloxam, p. 285. Scull-cap, ruff; Garter mantle over (chimere which has disappeared and) rochet.
29. JOHN JEGGON, Norwich, † 1618, at Aylsham. "Much abused" in the time of the civil war, "the head of the effigies being broken off." Blomefield's *Norfolk*, ii. 403. No longer existing.
30. JOHN OVERALL, Norwich, † 1619. Bust, erected by Cosin in Norwich Cathedral. Blomefield's *Norfolk*, ii. 403; Sir T. Browne's *Repertorium*, illustration p. 48; Sparrow's *Rationale* ed. 1657. Close-fitting cap, ruff; chimere and rochet.
31. LANCELOT ANDREWES, Winton, † 1626, Southwark. Two figures in Bloxam, p. 286. Coif, ruff; Garter mantle over chimere and rochet.
32. VALENTINE CAREY, Exeter, † 1626. R.E., Bloxam, p. 282. Academic cope like Grindal's q.v.
33. GEORGE MONTAIGNE, York, † 1628, Cawood, Yorkshire. R.E. ? now (1907) half broken up; upper half fixed on wall of church; possibly representing academic cope and rochet.
34. THOMAS DOVE, Peterborough, † 1630. R.E., erected by his son, destroyed in 1643. Described in Gunton's *Peterborough*, pp. 82-3, Lond. 1686. Coloured drawing, made in 1641, with text of inscriptions, in Sir Wm. Dugdale's MS. (the property of the Earl of Winchilsea and Nottingham, kindly lent for our use), fol. 129B. R.E., under heavy canopy. Black scull-cap, or coif, with white lining, covering ears; ruff, fastened with huge black bows, white garment, apparently made of fur in the upper part, with sleeves, hands together in prayer, ruffs at wrists.
35. SAMUEL HARSNETT, York, † 1631, Chigwell. Brass, fig. Morant's *Essex*; *Hierurgia*, iii. p. 229, &c. (Cf. Bloxam, p. 283, *Ass. Arch. Soc. Rep.* 10, p. 37). Effigy set up as directed by his will. Mitre with labels, ruff; flowered cope (morse hidden by beard), chimere, long rochet, with embroidery at neck and lower border; pastoral staff in left hand, Bible in right hand; no ring.

36. GEORGE ABBOT, Canterbury, †1633, Trinity Church, Guildford. R.E. white marble erected in 1635 by his brother, Sir Maurice Abbot. Under heavy canopy adorned with the cardinal Virtues. Coif, academic cope held up with left hand, rochet with full sleeves and turned down cuffs; r.h. holds book; l.h. has a ring on the ring finger.
37. AUGUSTINE LINDSELL, Hereford, †1634. R.E., Bloxam, p. 293, and personal inspection. Square cap; chimere, very long plaited rochet, worked border, full sleeves, large tippet.
38. THEOPHILUS FIELD, Hereford, †1636. Half-length bust on wall. Bloxam, p. 293. Scull-cap, ruff; chimere and rochet; book in hand.
39. JOHN THORNBOROUGH, Worcester, †1641. R.E., Bloxam, p. 292, and personal inspection. Close-fitting scull-cap, ruff; chimere, rochet, tippet.
40. GEORGE COKE, Hereford, †1646. R.E., Bloxam, p. 294, and personal inspection. Fine figure, well preserved. Close scull-cap, ruff; open chimere, rochet; very voluminous tippet, almost like a vestment.
41. JOHN WILLIAMS, York, †1650, Llandegai, near Bangor. Kneeling figure, half-size; Bloxam, p. 284, and personal inspection (Sept., 1907). Close-fitting cap; chimere, rochet; tippet, ruff; under ruff is a cross, being the head of a cross-staff (the point being visible below), with miniature pallium under it a few inches long—the idea being evidently taken from a shield of arms. The pallium has four crosses on it.
42. JOHN GAUDEN, Worcester, †1662. Bust half-length, marble, personally inspected. Scull-cap, bands; open chimere and rochet; book in r.h. by some supposed to be *Eikon Basiliké*, but more probably (as usual) a Bible. A mitre is over the arms at top of the monument.
43. ACCEPTED FREWEN, York, †1664. R.E., Bloxam, p. 284. Square cap; chimere, tippet, rochet. At his funeral (says Bloxam, p. 215), "the mitre, crozier [i.e. cross-staff], and pastoral staff were carried in procession by the heralds."
44. JOHN HACKET, Lichfield, †1670. R.E. in stone painted and in part gilded, erected by his son Andrew before 1674, as it was engraved by W. Hollar in that year in the first edition of Hacket's *Sermons*, published 1675. The plate is reproduced, without Hollar's name, in the Lichfield portion of Shaw's *Staffordshire*, pl. xxviii. Information from Canon Bodington. Mitre with ribbon and tassel on each side, gilt and vermilion; open chimere showing rochet; l.h. holds pastoral staff; r.h., crossed over breast, holds Bible. No hood, scarf, ring, or other ornament.

45. ROBERT CREIGHTON, Bath and Wells, †1672, Wells. R.E. Described by W. H. St. John Hope, *Archaeologia*, vol. 54 (correcting Bloxam, p. 291). Jewelled mitre with labels with fringed ends, over a cap with side flaps; shaped cope with jewelled border fastened by a small morse or brooch; no cope hood visible; plain girded alb, unappareled amice, cassock with sleeves buttoned at wrists; hands clasped in prayer, pastoral staff between body and right arm.
46. EDWARD REYNOLDS, Norwich, †1676. "A fair bust." Blomefield's *Norfolk*, ii. 418; Sir T. Browne's *Repertorium*, illustr., p. 73. No cap, falling collar; chimere, rochet.
47. GILBERT SHELDON, Canterbury, †1677, Croydon. R.E., reclining on left side, Bloxam, p. 216, and fine print, after drawing by T. Lawrence, in Lysons' *Environs of London*, i. p. 131, 1810, also in J. C. Anderson's *Croydon Church*. Mitre, falling bands, under which seems to be a medal; chimere, rochet, pastoral staff.
48. ROBERT BRIDEOAKE, Chichester, †1678, St. George's Chapel, Windsor. Reclining on mat, and resting on r. elbow, l.h. on breast, hands bare. Jewelled mitre, with broad labels; chimere, rochet with full sleeves, broad bands; staff by side.
49. JAMES SHARP, St. Andrews, in the parish church of St. Andrews, †1679. See C. J. Lyon's *Hist. of St. Andrews*, vol. ii. frontispiece and pp. 96 foll. Edinb. 1843. Kneeling figure under canopy. Scull-cap, chimere, rochet, scarf. The crosier in front of him is leaning against the side of the panel, the mitre is on the ground. Angels above are placing a crown on his head, PRO MITRA being inscribed on the background at the same level.
50. PATRICK SCOUGALL, Aberdeen, †1682, in the Cathedral Church. Half-length upright effigy. According to Mr. Eeles he is dressed in cassock and preaching gown (not as some have thought in rochet and chimere). Mitre and crosier appear as ornaments on the monument, not as borne by him.
51. RICHARD STERNE, York, †18 January, 1683. R.E., Bloxam, p. 284. Mitre, falling bands; chimere, rochet.
52. PETER GUNNING, Ely, †1684. R.E., marble, lying on side resting on left elbow. Figured on pl. 28 of *The History of the Church of Ely* by James Bentham, Cambridge, 1771; cp. Bloxam, p. 294. Mitre, bands; chimere, rochet, very wide tippet, Stuart collar; the head of a pastoral staff is seen under the pillow.
53. JOHN DOLBEN, York, †11 April, 1686. R.E., Bloxam, p. 284. Mitre, falling bands under chin; chimere, rochet.

54. JOHN PEARSON, Chester, †1686. R.E. designed by Sir A. Blomfield in 1876-7. Mitre, bands, chimere, rochet; hands crossed on a book which lies on his breast, no ring.
55. SETH WARD, Sarum, †1689. Bust on wall, head, shoulders, and breast. Personally inspected. Mitre, bands; chimere, tippet, rochet (with worked collar).
56. THOMAS LAMPLUGH, York, †5 May, 1691. Standing figure, Bloxam, p. 284-5. Mitre, falling bands under chin; chimere, tippet, rochet; l.h. holds staff.
57. JOHN TILLOTSON, Canterbury, †1694, St. Lawrence, Jewry. Marble medallion in mezzo-relievo, described by Rev. J. S. Barrass. Head bare, broad bands; chimere, rochet and tippet indicated. Medallion surmounted by mitre.
58. ROBERT GROVE, Chichester, †1696. Bust. Long flowing wig, bands resting on cassock, scarf crossed over breast; indications of a gown (?) at shoulders, but no arms visible.
59. NICHOLAS STRATFORD, Chester, †1707. Bust. Bareheaded; indications of chimere, tippet, and rochet.
60. JOHN SHARP, York, †2 Feb. 1714, R.E., Bloxam, p. 205. Mitre, falling bands; chimere, tippet, rochet.
61. RICHARD WILLIS, Winchester, †1734. Semi-recumbent effigy, Wig, bands, jewel of the Garter; chimere, tippet, and rochet.
62. HUGH BOULTER, Armagh, †1742, Westminster Abbey. Bust by H. Cheere. Head bare, flowing locks, bands. Indications of chimere, scarf, and rochet. Below bust are staff, anchor, books, mitre with large labels, censer burning.
63. JOHN HOUGH, Worcester, †1743. Semi-recumbent and fanciful figure by Roubiliac. Plate in John Wilmot's *Life*, p. 110, 1812, and personal inspection. Bare-headed, but with bands; chimere, tippet, rochet.
64. ROBERT BUTTS, Ely, †1748. Marble bust. Peruke, bands; chimere, wide tippet, rochet.
65. BENJAMIN HOADLY, Winchester, †1761. Bust in relief on medallion. Wig, bands, jewel of the Garter; indications of chimere, rochet with sleeves. The Garter mantle with tassels and badge is arranged in a pyramidal form above the medallion.
66. JAMES JOHNSON, Worcester, †1774. Bust in wig, with bands. Chimere, rochet, and scarf just indicated. P. i.
67. ZACHARY PEARCE, Rochester, †1774, Westminster Abbey. Bust. Wig and bands; round neck ribbon with medal of the Order of the Bath; indications of chimere, scarf, and rochet. Mitre, books, &c., below.

68. JOHN THOMAS, Rochester, †1793, Westminster Abbey. Bust. Wig and bands; indications of chimere, scarf and rochet. Medal of Order of the Bath under bust. Mitre, staff, books, chalice (with IHS) and paten with pile of sacramental bread arranged in layers and squares.
69. CHARLES AGAR, Earl of Normanton, Dublin, †1809, Westminster Abbey. Standing figure in high relief. Cherub above holding mitre over his head. Head bare, bands; round neck a broad ribbon or scarf holding up seal-purse of Order of St. Patrick with shamrock on it. Chimere, rochet; no scarf apparent, no ring.
70. HON. BROWNLOW NORTH, Winchester, †1820. Marble effigy by Chantrey. Kneeling figure. Wig and bands; chimere and rochet with full sleeves.
71. HON. HENRY RYDER, Lichfield, †1836. Kneeling figure. Head bare, bands; chimere, tippet, rochet. No ring.
72. HENRY BATHURST, Norwich, †1837. Marble seated figure. Wig, chimere, rochet. No ring.
73. WILLIAM OTTER, Chichester, †1840. Bust on pedestal. Head uncovered, bands, rochet with sleeves, and scarf.
74. JOSEPH ALLEN, Ely, †1845. Marble figure, full length, reclining with arm supported on cushion. Open chimere, rochet, bands, scarf, book. No ring.
75. WILLIAM HOWLEY, Canterbury, †1848. R.E. Cope, rochet; hands clasped over Bible on breast. No ring.
76. JOHN KAYE, Lincoln. †1853. R.E. by Westmacott. Head bare, bands; chimere and tippet, rochet; r.h. holds Bible; l.h. relinquishing staff. The latter was not actually used by him. No ring.
77. WILLIAM GRANT BROUGHTON, Sydney (N. S. W.), †1853, Canterbury. R.E. by Louch. Chimere, scarf, rochet, bands; l.h. on an open book; no ring.
78. JOHN BIRD SUMNER, Canterbury, †1862. R.E. by Weekes. Cope, rochet, bands; hands over Bible on breast. No ring.
79. JOHN GRAHAM, Chester, †1865. R.E. Mitre, bands, chimere, rochet; l.h. rests on a book standing on edge with a cross on the side; no ring.
80. JOHN LONSDALE, Lichfield, †1867. R.E. by G. Watts the painter. Mitre; cope with clasp, chimere, rochet, pastoral staff. Unhistorical as regards mitre, cope, and staff. No ring.
81. HON. SAMUEL WALDEGRAVE, Carlisle, †1869. R.E. marble by W. Wood. Head bare, bands; chimere, rochet, scarf.

Ordinary shoes with elastic sides. No ring or staff; l.h. clasps book.

82. WALTER KERR HAMILTON, Salisbury, †1869. R.E. under canopy. Jewelled mitre apparently without ribbons; cope with jewelled morse, embroidered stole, rochet, cassock; pastoral staff (not the one actually used by him). Oblong octagonal bevelled jewel to ring (as used by him) on ring-finger of right hand.
83. SAMUEL WILBERFORCE, Winton, †1873. R.E. mitre, cope, rochet, scarf; ring on ring-finger of right hand; staff (copied from his own staff preserved in a niche of the choir screen). Unhistorical as regards the mitre, and liturgical use of cope.
84. CHARLES RICHARD SUMNER, Winton, res. 1869, †1874. R.E. marble. Head bare, bands at neck, jewel of the garter. Garter mantle over chimere and rochet with full sleeves. Hands clasped over book; no ring.
85. GEORGE AUGUSTUS SELWYN, Lichfield, †1878. R.E. by Nicholls. Bareheaded, head resting on a New Zealand mat; jewel of SS. Michael and George; chimere and rochet; pastoral staff. Historical as regards staff and jewel. No ring.
86. ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL TAIT, Canterbury, †1882. R.E. by Boehm. Chimere, rochet, bands, scarf; hands crossed on breast, ring on ring-finger of r.h.
87. CHRISTOPHER WORDSWORTH, Lincoln, †1885. R.E. by Farmer and Brindley, under canopy. Medieval mitre; cope, rochet; pastoral staff on left side; hands together in posture of prayer, ring on ring-finger of left hand. Historical as regards cope and staff and ring; unhistorical as regards mitre.
88. JAMES RUSSELL WOODFORD, Ely, †1885. R.E. marble. Mitre, cope, alb, stole, jewelled gloves; staff. No ring.
89. GEORGE MOBERLY, Salisbury, †1885. R.E. under canopy, background with four scenes from official life. Bareheaded. Chimere with fastening under chin, scarf (confused with lappets of chimere), rochet. Pastoral staff copied from that actually used by himself and Bishop Hamilton. Ring with vesica-shaped jewel and arms (Salisbury and Moberly impaled) on ring finger of l.h.
90. EDWARD PARRY, Dover, †1889, Canterbury. R.E. by Forsyth. Chimere, rochet, scarf, ring on ring-finger of r.h.; right hand laid on Bible.
91. HARVEY GOODWIN, Carlisle, †1891. R.E. bronze by Thornycroft. Head bare; mitre at feet. Chimere, rochet, scarf,

indication of hood; hands together in prayer, ring on ring-finger of r.h.; no staff.

92. WILLIAM CONNOR MAGEE, York, †1891. R.E. at Peterborough, erected 1893. Chimere, rochet, and scarf, with band of hood; hands crossed on body, ring on ring-finger of left hand.
93. EDWARD HAROLD BROWNE, Winton, †1891. R.E. Mitre, cope, rochet, stole, cassock; ring on fore-finger of r.h., staff. Unhistorical as regards the mitre, and liturgical use of cope.
94. HENRY PHILPOTT, Worcester, †1892. Fine seated figure in marble in act of speaking. Bareheaded; chimere, scarf, rochet.
95. HON. JOHN THOMAS PELHAM, Norwich, †1894. R.E. marble. Chimere, rochet. No ring.
96. RICHARD DURNFORD, Chichester, †1895. R.E. in alabaster under canopy. Mitre, cope, alb, hands crossed on breast in the attitude of prayer, with ring on ring-finger of l.h. Staff.
97. EDWARD WHITE BENSON, Canterbury, †1896. R.E. by Brock. Cope, rochet, hands crossed over breast, ring on ring-finger of r.h.; archiepiscopal cross by the left side. There is no pectoral cross, though the archbishop constantly wore a plain one in his ordinary dress, and one more rarely over his robes.
98. MANDELL CREIGHTON, London, †1901. Standing figure in St. Paul's and at Peterborough. Mitre, cope, alb, pectoral cross; ring on forefinger of r.h.; staff.
99. FREDERICK TEMPLE, Canterbury, †1903. Kneeling figure before desk with open book, in bronze, by Pomeroy. Head bare. Cope, rochet, cross on breast, attached to the collar of the Victorian Order, presented to him after the Coronation, and worn by him on certain other occasions at the King's request. The Archbishop had previously (since the Queen's Jubilee of 1897) worn a cross then given to him, or another given later, on occasions, and with his robes, but never otherwise. The effigy has no ring.
100. GEORGE RIDDING, Southwell, †1904. Kneeling figure before desk with open book, in bronze, by Pomeroy. Head bare. Cope, rochet; ring on ring-finger of r.h., hands open and turned inwards and upwards. Staff lies on right of figure on alabaster base. "The face is a noble likeness of the Bishop" (Archdeacon Richardson). Mr. Carøe designed the monument. It is historical as regards cope and staff and ring.

ENGLISH LITURGICAL VESTMENTS

IN THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY

Being a Paper read before the Exeter Diocesan Architectural
and Archæological Society at the College Hall,
Exeter, September 13, 1895

BY

OSWALD J. REICHEL, M.A., B.C.L., F.S.A.

AUTHOR OF "MANUALS OF CANON LAW,"
"THE SEE OF ROME IN THE MIDDLE AGES," ETC.

JOHN HODGES,
BEDFORD STREET, STRAND, LONDON.

Elghteenpence net.

New Books and Books in the Press.

By the Rev. OSWALD J. REICHEL, M.A., B.C.L., F.S.A.,
sometime Vice-principal of Cuddesdon College.

Solemn Mass at Rome in the Ninth Century.

Second Edition, with corrections and additions, and a sketch plan of a Basilica. Demy 8vo. [Just ready.]

The Origin of English Liturgical Vestments, prescribed for use in the Thirteenth Century. With Six Illustrations. A Paper read before the Exeter Diocesan Society.

8vo. [Just ready.]

A Complete Manual of Canon Law.

Vol. I. The Sacraments. Demy 8vo. [Nearly ready.]

Vol. II. Liturgical Discipline. [Preparing.]

The Pathway of Health and Happiness. In

Six Letters to Young Men of all classes, by a Clergyman of the Church of England. Royal 32mo, limp cloth, price 1s; in roan tuck, 2s. [Ready.]

Bible Stories for Children and Schools.

Second Thousand. Square 16mo, cloth, 2s. 6d. [Just Ready.]

Christianity versus Infidelity. Notes on

Ingersoll, by the Rev. L. A. LAMBERT, of Waterlow, N.Y. A New Edition reprinted from the seventieth thousand American Edition. [In the Press.]

The Reformation in England: A Series of

Essays, by the late Dr. MAITLAND, Keeper of the MSS. at Lambeth; Author of the "Dark Ages," &c.

This Volume is being published at the special request of many readers of the "Dark Ages," to which work it is an admirable Supplement. [In the Press]

Evans (A. B.)—Reflections Delivered at the

Mid-Day Celebration of Holy Communion in the Church of S. Mary-le-Strand. By A. B. EVANS, D.D., late Rector. Crown 8vo. [Third Edition in the Press.]

JOHN HODGES, BEDFORD STREET, STRAND, LONDON.

ENGLISH LITURGICAL VESTMENTS

“HEROES OF THE CROSS.”

UNDER the above title is now publishing a series of Biographies of eminent Christians who have lived in all ages of the Christian Church.

The Lives will aim to be historical rather than devotional, and controversy will be avoided. Each Biography will be complete in One Vol. Crown 8vo, price, in cloth, 3s. 6d. net.

READY.

ST. GREGORY THE GREAT.

By THE RIGHT REV. ABBOT SNOW, O.S.B.

READY.

CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS:

HIS LIFE, LABOURS AND DISCOVERIES.

By MARIANA MONTEIRO.

READY.

THE RIGHT REV. SAMUEL SEABURY, D.D.

FIRST BISHOP OF CONNECTICUT AND OF THE AMERICAN CHURCH.

By E. BEARDSLEY, D.D.,

PRESIDENT OF THE GENERAL CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN CHURCH.

IN THE PRESS.

ST. STEPHEN HARDING,

FOUNDER OF THE CISTERCIAN ORDER.

Reprinted from “Newman's Lives of the Saints.”

IN THE PRESS.

ST. COLUMBA:

THE STORY OF HIS LIFE.

By S. KEYWORTH.

SEVERAL OTHERS PREPARING

JOHN HODGES, BEDFORD ST., STRAND, W.C.

